3 1822 02212 8383

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF
SAN DIEGO

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SAN DIEGO

3 1822 02212 8383

BL

485

B5

XX

Social Sciences & Humanities Library

University of California, San Diego

Please Note: This item is subject to recall.

Date Due

JUN 17 1997

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE RELIGION
OF RUSSIA

CHISWICK PRESS

*The woodcuts in this book were specially engraved for
the S.S.P.P. by Mr. W. M. R. Quick.*

CHURCH OF THE RESURRECTION, PETROGRAD

See page 64.

Woodcut engraved by W. M. R. Quick.

THE RELIGION OF
RUSSIA. A STUDY
OF THE ORTHODOX
CHURCH IN RUSSIA,
FROM THE POINT OF
VIEW OF THE CHURCH
IN ENGLAND. BY G. B. H.
BISHOP, VICAR OF CARDINGTON, SALOP,
AND AN HON. DIOCESAN SECRETARY &
LECTURER FOR THE ANGLICAN AND
EASTERN ASSOCIATION. DEDICATED BY
PERMISSION TO THE RIGHT REVEREND
FATHER IN GOD, *ARTHUR FOLEY*,
LORD BISHOP OF LONDON, PRESIDENT
OF THE AFORENAMED ASSOCIATION

*Loquere
Filiis
Israel*

*ut
profi-
ciscantur*

LONDON: THE SOCIETY OF SS. PETER
AND PAUL, 32 GEORGE ST., HANOVER
SQUARE, AND 302 REGENT ST., W. 1915

THE CONTENTS OF THIS BOOK

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	I
HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH	4
PUBLIC WORSHIP	
(1) Ornaments of Church and Ministers	14
(2) The Liturgy and Divine Office	20
FAITH AND PRACTICE	26
THE HIERARCHY	37
THE LAITY	45
PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS	55
FOREIGN RELATIONS	67
INTER-COMMUNION	74
APPENDICES	
A. Russian Orthodox Missions	83
B. The Central Portion of the <i>Anaphora</i> , or Canon of the Mass	85
C. The Council of Florence, 1438-9	88
INDEX	91

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

	TO FACE
	PAGE
CHURCH OF THE RESURRECTION, PETROGRAD. <i>Frontispiece</i>	
THE LAST MOMENTS OF S. PHILIP	1
THE HEART OF RUSSIA	8
THE PATRIARCH NIKHON AND THE TSAR ALEXIS	12
THE USPENSKY SOBOR, MOSCOW	14
THE LITURGICAL VESTMENTS	18
A MODERN IKONOSTAS	22
THE GREAT ENTRANCE DURING THE HOLY LITURGY	22
A FINE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY IKONOSTAS	30
THE CELEBRATED IKON OF OUR LADY OF KAZAN	36
THE TROITSKY LAVRA	41
TWO OLD PEASANTS OF THE UKRAINE.	46
TCHOUTOVKA:	
The Old Wooden Church	52
The Ornaments of the Altar	52
Father Johann	56
The Village Altar	56
THE MONASTERY OF LOUBNY	59
A MODERN IKONOSTAS IN THE CHURCH OF S. SAVIOUR, MOSCOW	68
TCHOUTOVKA:	
Girls dancing on the Feast of S. Boris	73
Peasants resting at mid-day	73

THE LAST MOMENTS OF S. PHILIP, METROPOLITAN OF MOSCOW (c. 1568). See page 12.

Woodcut engraved by W. M. R. Quick. After the painting by Novoskoltzeff.

THE RELIGION OF RUSSIA

INTRODUCTION

THE Russian nation has been frequently described as the most religious in Christendom. Whether the statement be in all respects true or not, there can be no doubt that in no other country do the people give a more whole-hearted allegiance to the Catholic Church of Christ in its local embodiment. The Orthodox Church in Russia is not merely national in the technical sense of being the sole historic representative in that land of the one Apostolic Church, but it is also national because it enshrines the deepest convictions of an overwhelming majority of the Russian people.

It is a striking testimony to our insularity in religious matters that so few of us know anything of the greatest national church in the world. The average intelligent Christian in these islands surmises that the religion of Russia is *Greek Church*, a term which is vaguely associated in his mind with venerable bearded priests, nasal chanting, gorgeous churches, and elaborate ceremonial. Of the history, dogma, and present condition of Russian Orthodoxy he knows absolutely nothing.

At the present time, when the exigencies of international politics have resulted in an alliance between Great Britain and Russia, it is more important than ever that efforts

should be made on both sides to acquire a better understanding of our respective religious positions. It is not too much to say that we have a great deal to learn from each other.

The Russians are essentially a race of country folk. They have comparatively few large towns, and these are so far artificial in character that, but for the churches, a visitor could hardly believe himself to be in a Sláv country. This is notably the case with Petrograd. By a stroke of the pen the Tsar can indeed translate the German name of his capital into Russ; but the only way to nationalize the city itself would be to raze it to the ground and build a village among the ruins. It is not surprising, therefore, that town life generally spoils a Russian, for he is not in his proper environment; and it follows from this that those who desire to know the real Russia must seek her not in the large towns, but in the more congenial surroundings of the countryside. It was my good fortune in 1911, when a layman, to spend five months in a remote district of "Little Russia the Blessed," about one thousand miles distant from Petrograd. In so short a time it was possible to gain only a superficial knowledge of the people and their national institutions, but even a superficial knowledge of Russia is more than most of us possess, and it is with the desire to interest others in a most fascinating subject that I have collected the following impressions of the Church in Russia, recently contributed, by request, to the *Scottish Chronicle*. If it be true that he who would form a just opinion in any matter must approach it with as much sympathy and as little prejudice as possible, then I claim that nobody is better qualified to estimate Russian Orthodoxy at its proper value than an

English Churchman. To a Roman Catholic the Orthodox Church is schismatic, an unnatural rebel against the Holy See; in Protestant eyes she is a decadent mummy, swathed in the musty wrappings of a Byzantine creed and ceremonial; but a thoughtful Anglican discovers that beneath her strange outward aspect there is life, devotion, and a steady adherence to many great truths which he values for himself, and for which he believes the Church of England also stands. Accordingly he is able in a unique degree to understand and appreciate the religion of Russia. From such a point of view this little book has been written.

One thing more. For the sake of clearness I have spoken of the various subdivisions of Catholic Christendom as *churches* or *communions*; but the use of these terms must not be taken to indicate adherence to the "branch theory," or indeed to any other theory which seems to acquiesce in our unhappy divisions. Christ founded but one Church, one Communion, and there can be no other. It is an unhappy fact that within the one Church human infirmity has erected barriers which effectually limit our vision and hinder our work. There is no duty more pressing than to labour for their removal. That this book may accomplish a little to that end is my earnest desire.

* * * * *

For much valuable advice and criticism my best thanks are due to Mr. W. J. Birkbeck, the best English authority on the religion of Russia. I have also to thank the Reverend H. J. Fynes-Clinton, General Secretary of the Anglican and Eastern Association, for the loan of seven photographs here reproduced.

I

HISTORY OF THE RUSSIAN CHURCH

IN order to appreciate the present position of the Church in Russia it will be helpful to recall briefly some familiar points in the early history of Christianity.

Most people will agree that our Lord founded a Church, within the fold of which all his followers, without exception, were to be gathered. To this Church he committed for all time the supreme task of bearing authoritative witness to the Truth. Moreover before his ascension Christ instituted a hierarchy in the persons of the Apostles, whom he commissioned to rule and guide the Church as his representatives. It was from the first a necessary duty of every faithful Christian to *continue in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship*.

DEVOLUTION OF THE MINISTRY

At first the Christian society was small and compact, but in the course of a few years congregations were established in towns and villages over an area too wide for regular apostolic ministrations. In consequence the Apostles, by an exercise of the authority they had received from Christ, instituted the lesser orders of deacons and presbyters or priests,¹

¹ It would perhaps be more accurate to say that the Apostles admitted the deacons and priests to a share in their own functions. Of course the apostolate included from the first all the other ministerial offices.

of whom some were permanently stationed in each community as its pastors and teachers. For a time the Apostles exercised a general supervision over these clergy and their congregations, but as the Church expanded and their own numbers decreased, it became evident that a third order of ministers was required to assist and later to succeed them in this work of supervision. Such men as Timothy and Titus were chosen from among the presbyters, and were further commissioned to *rule the Church of God, to set in order the things that are wanting, and to appoint presbyters in every city, to teach, exhort, and reprove with all authority.* The title of *bishop*, which at first had been more loosely used, soon became restricted to this order.

SUCCESSORS OF THE APOSTLES

With us it is a commonplace that the Apostles delegated to their successors the bishops such part of their office and authority as was permanently necessary for the right governance of the Church. In every well-established centre the local Christians were guided and controlled by their bishop, acting with the advice of his presbyters. The functions of the bishop did not end, however, with the oversight of his flock and the provision of a succession of properly ordained pastors. He was also the link between his diocese and the rest of Catholic Christendom.¹ To be in fellowship with the local bishop was to be within the fold of the Universal Church.

¹ The earliest *known* use of the term *Catholic Church* is found in the epistles of S. Ignatius, the second Bishop of Antioch, who was martyred in A.D. 107.

Theoretically all bishops were equal in authority, but in the course of time those who ruled in great cities, or whose sees were apostolic foundations, attained an eminence superior to that of the rest in dignity and influence. Such were the bishops of Rome in Western Christendom, and the bishops of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem in the East. To the occupants of these five sees was accorded the title of *patriarch*, and their spheres of influence taken together were roughly co-terminous with Christendom.

THE SCHISM

With the passage of time, differences of temperament and an unworthy rivalry among the leading patriarchs led to an increasing estrangement between East and West. Controversies arose which provided ample pretext for a serious quarrel. The visible unity of the Catholic Church was at stake, but unhappily the leaders on both sides were not in the right frame of mind to deal with the questions in dispute. On 16 July 1054, the open rupture took place. Roman legates laid a bull of excommunication upon the altar of the Cathedral of S. Sophia at Constantinople. The Patriarch Michael Cerularius replied in like strain, and the outward unity of the Catholic Church was destroyed. The Patriarchs of Jerusalem, Alexandria, and Antioch supported their brother of Constantinople against the Patriarch of Rome. From that time onwards each half of Christendom proceeded to act as though the other did not exist. The Roman Church is not more rigid and uncompromising than the Church in the East in claiming to be the whole Catholic Church of Christ.

BIRTH OF RUSSIAN CHRISTIANITY

It was during the incidents which led to the unhappy breach of 1054 that Christianity in its Eastern form was introduced into Russia. Only in its infancy, therefore, was the Russian Church in communion with Western Christendom. As in our own land, many legends have gathered round the earliest missions to the Russian people, but we will confine ourselves to definite historical facts. Towards the close of the tenth century there reigned at Kieff a prince named Vladímir, a descendant of the Northman Rurik. His grandmother Olga had been converted to Christianity, but he himself was a heathen, "a ferocious prince, as much distinguished by his zeal for the rude idolatry of his countrymen as for his savage crimes." Becoming dissatisfied with his pagan faith, and having heard of the splendour of Christian worship at Constantinople, Vladímir sent an embassy to visit the famous metropolis and return with a report upon the religion of its people. The visitors were quite overpowered by what they saw in the great Cathedral of S. Sophia,¹ and returned with a favourable verdict. "When we stood in the temple," they said, "we did not know where we were, for there is nothing else like it on earth; there in truth God has his dwelling among men. . . . We can no longer abide in heathenism." Vladímir was favourably impressed, and shortly afterwards, when concluding peace with the Eastern Emperor Basil, he accepted Christianity on marrying Basil's sister, Anne. On his return home Vladímir gave orders for the wholesale conversion of his people and

¹ The altar was of solid gold ornamented with splendid gems. The screen was adorned with plates of gold and with costly marbles and mosaics.

thousands of them were baptized in the Dnyépr at Kieff, which city thus became the cradle of Russian Christianity. Bishops and priests were sent from Constantinople to instruct the new converts, and in the more civilized districts the Faith spread rapidly. The missionaries were fortunate in having the Psalms, the greater part of the New Testament, and the Liturgy¹ already translated into the language of their people, a factor which contributed largely to the success of their efforts.

ITS EXPANSION

For about three hundred years the work of consolidation and expansion proceeded, and during this period the Russian Christians looked to the archbishops of Kieff for leadership and governance. In 1325, however, the Grand Prince Ivan I, with the strong approval of the aged Archbishop Peter, Metropolitan of Kieff, established his capital at Moscow, which thereafter became both the civil and religious centre of the Sláv tribes, now gradually uniting under one leader against the menace of the Tatar hordes. Moscow, "the city of innumerable churches, of everlasting bells, of endless processions, of palace and church combined, of tombs and thrones, and relics and treasures," has ever since been the Holy City of Russia, round which have gathered all the noblest aspirations of the Russian people. If Petrograd has become the head of the nation, Moscow remains its heart. From the neighbouring² monastery of

¹ Liturgy: *i.e.*, the Communion Service, Eucharistic Office, or Mass, exclusively.

² "Neighbouring" as Russians count distance. It is nearly fifty miles away.

THE HEART OF RUSSIA

A view of the Kremlin at Moscow. The five buildings in the foreground, beginning on the left, are: the Imperial Palace, the Church of the Annunciation, the Church of the Archangel Michael, the Cathedral of the Assumption, and the Tower of Ivan the Terrible.

the Holy Trinity came the inspiration which sent forth the Grand Prince Dmitri to the battle of the Don, where the dreaded Tatárs, so long masters of Russia, received the crushing defeat which checked for a time their domination. In 1472 it was the Archbishop Bassian who almost drove the disheartened Grand Prince Ivan III to that last advance, when the Tatárs fled before the Russian arms. "Dost thou fear death? Thou too must die as well others; death is the lot of all, man, beast, and bird alike; none avoid it. Give these warriors into my hand, and, old as I am, I will not spare myself, nor turn my back upon the Tatárs." England owes much to her Church, but Russia owes yet more, her very existence. Nor was the Church lacking in the second great crisis of 1606-1613, when the victorious Poles were masters of Moscow itself and the Roman Mass was celebrated in its principal cathedral. When all seemed lost, it was the same great monastery, half church half fortress, which resisted and eventually drove back the Poles. Moscow was re-captured; again the Church had saved the people. Small wonder that to this day the Troitsky Monastery is thronged with pilgrims—that the Tsar never goes to Moscow without paying a visit to the great shrine of patriotism and religion.

AUTONOMY

During these stirring times a notable change had taken place within the Russian Church. For four and a half centuries it had been subject to the patriarchs of Constantinople, who had always been consulted in the appointment of its higher officers. With the increasing growth and importance of the National Church, it was felt that a

greater measure of independence was desirable, and this aspiration was ultimately sanctioned by the Greek patriarchs, whose prestige was dimmed in consequence of the Ottoman capture of Constantinople. In 1448, for the first time, a new metropolitan of Moscow was appointed without consulting the distant patriarch, and in 1589, with the assent of all four Eastern patriarchs, the primate of Moscow was given a rank and title equal to their own. He was hailed by Orthodox Christendom as supplying the place of the patriarch of Rome, who was held to have been rightly thrust out of the Catholic Church on account of his heresy and schism. The impropriety of calling the independent national Church of Russia after the land whence came its first bishops is obvious. The Russian Church is just as much Greek as that of the United States is Scottish or English.

The third patriarch of Moscow was Philaret, who had been archbishop of Rostoff. With his accession there ensued a situation probably unparalleled in history, for the reigning Tsar Michael Romanoff was none other than the new Patriarch's son. The old royal house of Rurik was extinct; the nobility had failed to agree upon any of the numerous aspirants for the throne; a national assembly met, and Michael was elected Tsar. For some years the Patriarch and his imperial son ruled the destinies of Russia side by side, and the dynasty thus established continues to the present day.

THE RISE OF DISSENT

We have now to consider the rise of dissent in Russia, and here one is struck by the complete contrast between

Russian religious history and that of England. While in England the principal cause of dissent was the refusal of the English reformers to advance beyond a certain point lest they should destroy the Catholic character of the Church of England, in Russia dissent arose because men objected to any reforms whatsoever. Large bodies of Christians left the Church because the text of the Liturgy was compared with the standard text and carefully revised, because the spelling of the sacred Name of our Lord was corrected, because (horrible to relate!) the sign of the Cross was made with the wrong number of fingers. These alterations, together with such innovations among the laity as smoking, and shaving the beard, disturbed the more ignorant Russians to an alarming degree. We shall check our disposition to smile at such a ridiculous state of things when we remember how difficult it is in many of our own parishes for a priest to effect quite small improvements in the conduct of public worship. Preposterous as the tenets of the Russian dissenters undoubtedly are, they are held to-day by about eleven millions of uneducated persons. This seems an immense number, but it is only a small fraction of the population. Generally speaking the dissenting bodies are treated with considerable leniency, but there are some odd sects like the Skoptsi (self-mutilators), Dietoubitsi (child-slayers), and Dushilshchiki (suffocators), which are a menace to society, and are quite properly excluded from toleration by the State. The reforms already mentioned took place under the Patriarch Nikhon (1652-67), and they helped ultimately to bring about his fall. His work was taken up afresh by Peter the Great (1689-1725), the founder of modern Russia, who did much to further the cause of education,

foster morality (in others), and restrict the undue increase of monasteries and monastic property.

ABOLITION OF THE PATRIARCHATE

Peter was opposed by the Patriarch Adrian, and on the death of the latter, about 1700, he determined to abolish the patriarchal office. For nearly twenty years he kept the see of Moscow vacant, and then established in place of the patriarch a committee called the Holy Governing Synod. This Synod still rules the Russian Church, and is regarded as exercising the authority of the patriarchs. There are eight or nine members, all of them ecclesiastics. With them is associated a layman, the Tsar's procurator, who has considerable influence. If ever there was a country where the Church is regarded as a branch of the Civil Service it is Russia. On several occasions Russians have accused the Church in England of submitting to the undue interference of the State in religious affairs. It is, however, quite certain that we should not tolerate for one moment nowadays such a degree of State bondage as that to which they not unwillingly submit. Indeed there has never been any really serious conflict between the ecclesiastical and secular authorities if we except the personal quarrel between the Patriarch Nikhon and the courtiers of the Tsar Alexis. Even S. Philip, the only canonized metropolitan of Moscow (1568¹), suffered death for his public protest against the savage crimes of Ivan the Terrible and not for opposing his lawful authority. "Where would my faith be if I kept silence?" he cried. "Here we are offering up the bloodless sacrifice to the Lord, while behind the altar flows the inno-

¹ See woodcut facing page 1.

THE PATRIARCH NIKHON AND THE TSAR ALEXIS

At the Shrine of S. Philip in the Cathedral of the Assumption
at Moscow. From a painting by Litovchenko

cent blood of Christian men.” The brave old man was at once arrested, and in a little while had gained the martyr’s crown.

In modern times the charge of inertia and “museum religion” which critics have often brought against the Eastern Church is becoming increasingly unjust so far as its largest section is concerned. Considerable missionary¹ activity has been displayed of late, and at home there are signs of advance all along the line. The extreme religious conservatism of the peasant doubtless exerts a check upon rapid improvement. Their superstition is very considerable, but let us remember that mixed up with much that is childish and superstitious, there is usually in the heart of the Russian peasant a very genuine loyalty to the Church and her Divine Head.

¹ See Appendix A.

II

PUBLIC WORSHIP

(I) ORNAMENTS OF CHURCH AND MINISTERS

BEFORE proceeding to describe the celebration of the Holy Mysteries, it may be well to explain the interior arrangements of an Orthodox church, which differ greatly from those with which we are familiar. To begin with, one notices that a Russian church is much smaller than one of corresponding importance in this country. The reason for this is that the normal attitude of an Orthodox Christian during public worship is standing; consequently he takes up less room than a Western, who requires space for sitting and kneeling. The churches gain much in dignity from the absence of rows of chairs and pews, but they do so at the expense of the Faithful, for the services are extremely long and fatiguing.

THE IKONOSTAS AND NAVE

To the Western, however, the most interesting features in a Russian church are the close screening of the altar and the absence of a chancel. To use familiar phraseology, the building consists of nave and sanctuary, separated by a large and massive screen, called the ikonostas (*Greek*, Εἰκονοστάσιον).¹

¹ There would appear to be no authority for the usual English spelling of this word—ikonostasis.

THE USPENSKY SOBOR, MOSCOW

The Patriarchal Cathedral of the Assumption. This church was built in 1474-9, and is the scene of the Imperial Coronations. Here, too, lie the bodies of the patriarchs.

This extends across the whole width of the sanctuary, and reaches almost to the roof. Where all is gorgeous, the screen stands out as the most splendidly decorated part of the church. In a wealthy parish it is frequently constructed of marble, inset with large gold and silver ikons. As the word implies, every ikonostas is ornamented with the ikons or sacred pictures which play such an important part in Russian religious life. Usually there are numerous small ikons, and either four or six large ones, according to the size of the screen. The principal ikons always number among them representations of our Lord, the Blessed Virgin Mother, and the patron saint of the church. They are frequently decorated with jewels of considerable value. The screen is pierced by three openings, of which the central one is the most important, giving access to the altar which stands immediately behind it. This entrance is closed by a double gate known as the royal doors, behind which hangs a red or purple veil. At certain stages of the Liturgy these doors are closed, and the veil is drawn. Of the two other entrances to the sanctuary that on the left is the more important, as it is through this door that the clergy make their two ceremonial entrances to the body of the church during the Liturgy. The right-hand door simply provides access to the vestry.

Before the screen is a low narrow daïs, upon which the deacon and members of the choir stand. Sometimes, however, the choir is concealed from view elsewhere. In country churches the choir, consisting of both sexes, frequently occupies a gallery at the back of the church. The surplice is quite unknown in Orthodox countries, and as a general rule choristers wear simply their ordinary clothes in church.

In a few great cathedrals, however, they may be seen vested in robes not unlike those worn by the choir in our own chapels-royal. The singing is, of course, quite unaccompanied, and is often very beautiful and impressive. Instrumental music is as unknown as it used to be amongst the Scottish Presbyterians. To conclude our description of the body of the church it only remains to say that the walls and pillars are usually inset with ikons so that the whole place glows with colour, atoning thereby for the severity of its outline.

THE SANCTUARY

We now turn to the sanctuary. The whole space within the screen is called the altar, the altar proper being termed the throne, or sometimes the holy table, as in the Book of Common Prayer. The east end of the sanctuary is divided into three recesses facing the three doors of the ikonostas. The large central recess, which faces the holy table and the royal gates, contains the bishop's chair, with six more on either side for his attendant clergy. Thus the bishop is Christ's representative, and the clergy the successors of the Apostles. In the left hand recess, which faces the north door of the screen, stands the table of the *prothesis*, upon which the elements are "set out" beforehand for the celebration of the Liturgy. In the tiny village church at Tchoutovka, where I stayed for some months, the table of the *prothesis* was represented by a large corner bracket with a canopy. The right hand recess in the sanctuary, facing the south door of the screen, serves as a vestry, and requires no further description.

THE ALTAR

The altar proper is, of course, the most conspicuous ornament of the sanctuary, and differs in many ways from our own. It is a large cube of hard wood, marble, or even of silver-gilt, covered with various cloths. The most important of these is the *antiminsion*, a square of silk or fine linen, corresponding in some respects to our *corporal*. It is specially consecrated, and must contain a relic. If need be, it can be spread for the celebration of the Holy Liturgy, where there is no altar, for example, on board ship. The other principal ornaments of the altar are the book of gospels, the cross, and the pyx, which contains the reserved Sacrament for the sick. Between the altar and the royal gates lies a strip of carpet, upon which no layman is permitted to step. There are tapers on the altar, and several tall lights are grouped around it as a rule. Behind the altar one often finds a representation of the Jewish seven-branched candlestick.

THE SACRED VESTMENTS

The vestments of the clergy are very beautiful and dignified, and though of rather a different pattern, are for the most part identical with the Eucharistic vestments with which we are familiar. All three orders of the clergy wear alb and stole. The latter ornament, however, in the case of bishops and priests, is sewn together from the neck downwards, so that it forms a single broad band reaching nearly to the feet. Over the alb and other minor ornaments a priest wears a *felon* or chasuble, cut away in front but very long

behind. A bishop dispenses with the chasuble, even at Mass, wearing instead the *sakkos*, a kind of dalmatic made of some rich and handsome material. Originally the *sakkos* was worn only by patriarchs, but in the course of time it was adopted by metropolitans and archbishops. Not until the eighteenth century did its use become general among the Russian bishops. At solemn services other than the Liturgy bishops are vested in the *mantija*, a flowing garment not unlike the Western cope. Other emblems of dignity restricted to the episcopate are the pastoral staff¹ and the *omophorion*, an Eastern form of the pallium. The crown-shaped mitre is worn not only by bishops but also by archimandrites or abbots, and occasionally by certain dignitaries called arch-priests. Vestments may be of any colour, as the Orthodox Church has no rule in the matter. At the same service one may see the different clergy wearing robes of white, gold, green, and purple, according to the resources of the sacristan. Incense is used at all services. "This use of incense," says an Orthodox catechist, "shows the faithful that just as the incense is always burning in the fire of the censer, and ascends with sweet odours upwards, so in the same way ought their prayers to be kindled and inflamed unceasingly by the fire in their hearts of faith, hope, and love towards God, and that these prayers should ascend fragrant and acceptable before the Throne of the Divine Majesty."

A GREAT CATHEDRAL

In Russia the title of *sobór* or *cathedral* is not restricted to the church in which the bishop has his seat. Thus in

¹ I should have mentioned that the staff is also used by abbots and abbesses.

THE LITURGICAL VESTMENTS

PRIEST WEARING ALB, STOLE, AND
CHASUBLE

BISHOP VESTED IN SAKKOS AND
OMOPHORION

MODEL OF DEACON WEARING COLOURED
ALB AND STOLE

Petrograd one finds the cathedrals of S. Isaak, of Our Lady of Kazan, of SS. Peter and Paul, and so on. As a matter of fact, S. Isaak's is the cathedral proper of the capital, and the others are what we should call collegiate churches.

S. Isaak's is a massive building in the Renaissance style, constructed entirely of granite and marble. Its vast dome is covered with plates of gold, which prepare one for the magnificence of the interior. The ikonostas is specially remarkable for its beauty. The royal gates in the centre are of bronze, plated with gold, and together they weigh about a ton. On either side of the gates is a pillar of lapis lazuli, deep blue in colour; the pair were erected at a cost of thirty thousand pounds. The screen itself is of Italian marble, and has embedded in it eight tall pillars of green malachite set upon bronze bases. Between them are six huge ikons worked in mosaic. Those near the royal gates are of Italian workmanship, which is of finer grain than the Russian. They represent on one side the Virgin Mother with the Holy Child, and on the other the Saviour. The other four ikons are of S. Katharine, S. Alexander Nevsky, Isaak the Patron Saint, and S. Nicolai the Bishop. In the sanctuary there is a large square altar of silver-gilt, which is covered with cloth of gold. Behind the altar stands a model of the church also of silver-gilt, weighing nearly two hundred-weight. This is the tabernacle for the reserved Sacrament. The sanctuary is lighted by an enormous stained-glass window of German workmanship, the only stained window I remember seeing in a Russian church. It represents our Lord, and is said to be worth ten thousand pounds. At night the window is illuminated from the exterior, so that worshippers are able to see it as well as by daylight.

Beneath this window stands a somewhat unpretentious marble chair, the *cathedra* or episcopal throne of the metropolitan of Petrograd and Ladoga. Immediately within the screen, on either side of the altar, are the seats of the metropolitans of Moscow and Kieff, and from these, arranged in choir, extend those of other Russian bishops. On my first visit to S. Isaak's these seats were not in position, so I conjectured that on the latter occasion the Holy Synod¹ was in session. In the nave of the church, standing before the screen, are various ikons and reliquaries of some interest. In one of these ikons is set a diamond the size of a large pigeon's egg. This splendid gem is surrounded by smaller diamonds which are themselves of great value.

The cathedral is of considerable height, and from the top of the dome one can distinguish objects twenty miles distant. The four principal entrances are closed by enormous bronze doors, with representations in high relief of the lives of the saints. Each pair of doors weighs twelve hundred *poods*, that is to say nearly twenty-two tons.

This brief description of the Russian S. Paul's will serve to convey some idea of the splendour of the Orthodox churches.

(2) THE LITURGY AND DIVINE OFFICE

Having now obtained some idea of the setting of public worship, we proceed to consider the Divine Liturgy or Mass itself. It should be assumed that the office of Sext is nearing completion. The priest leaves the sanctuary and, standing before the screen, salutes the principal ikons. He then

¹ The Synod meets in a palace near the cathedral.

returns to the sanctuary and puts on the sacred vestments, afterwards proceeding to the table of the *prothesis* to prepare the vessels and elements for the Sacrifice.

This preparation is an integral part of the service, abounding in beautiful symbolism, of which the following is an example. Having set apart the required portion of the bread (which is called the Lamb), the priest pierces it with a small lancet and then fills the chalice saying, "And one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith there came out blood and water." The ceremonies of the preparation being ended, the public part of the Liturgy begins. As this is extremely intricate and lengthy, it would perhaps be well to give only a rough analysis here, with the two great divisions clearly marked.

(A) LITURGY OF THE CATECHUMENS

- I. Benediction and Litany of Peace: Psalms: Little Litany, etc.
- II. The LESSER ENTRANCE.—Taperers, followed by the deacon bearing the Gospels, and by the priest, come forth from the north door of the screen, and after prayers before the royal gates pass through again into the sanctuary. The choir sings a liturgical hymn.
- III. The ponomar (reader) chants the Epistle, and the dyakon (deacon) the Gospel for the day.
- IV. Great Litany of Supplications: Litanies for the Departed, and for the Catechumens or adult candidates for Baptism. (The catechumens used to depart at this point. There are, of course, none nowadays.)

(B) LITURGY OF THE FAITHFUL

- I. Little Litanies: The Cherubic Hymn, during which the altar, prothesis, and ikons on the screen are censed.
- II. The GREAT ENTRANCE.—Taperers, the deacon (supporting the paten against his forehead and bearing veil and censer), and the priest (bearing the prepared chalice), again issue and re-enter as before, placing the vessels on the altar.
- III. Litany of the Offertory (with the royal gates closed and the veil drawn).
- IV. Litany of Supplications: the Kiss of Peace.
- V. Nicene Creed (royal doors open).
- VI. The ANAPHORA¹ or CANON (with the doors again closed).
 - (a) *Sursum Corda* and Preface.
 - (b) *Sanctus* and *Benedictus qui venit*.
 - (c) Recital of the Institution of the Eucharist.
 - (d) Memorial offering of the bread and wine. (*The Anamnesis*).
 - (e) Invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the Elements.
 - (f) Oblation of the Body and Blood of Christ, with intercessions.
 - (g) Litany of the *Anaphora*.
 - (h) Pater Noster.
 - (i) Elevation of the Host.
 - (j) Fraction of the Host and commixture in the Chalice.
 - (k) Communion of the priest and laity (if any desire) in both kinds by intinction.

¹ See Appendix B.

A MODERN IKHNOSTAS
A Lector stands before the Royal Gates

THE GREAT ENTRANCE DURING THE HOLY
LITURGY

- VII. Post-communion hymn : Litany of Thanksgiving.
VIII. Dismissal with Blessing.

The above is an analysis of the liturgy of S. John Chrysostom, the one in normal use. Scottish Churchmen will observe an almost exact parallel between the Canon of the Orthodox Liturgy and that of their own national Order.

The Russian *sloujebnik* or missal contains two other liturgies, those of S. Basil and of the Presanctified. The Liturgy of S. Basil, which is the earliest, and the source whence the others were derived, is only used on the Sundays in Lent (excluding Palm Sunday) and on some four or five other occasions. The Liturgy of the Presanctified is read on Wednesdays and Fridays during Lent. As its name implies, the reserved Sacrament is used throughout this service, consequently there is no consecration. In Holy Week the Mass of the Presanctified is celebrated on the Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, but on Good Friday there is no mass of any kind whatsoever. On days in Lent when there is neither a celebration of the Holy Liturgy, nor even communion with the Presanctified, a brief service known as the *Typika* is held. It consists of portions of the Liturgy without consecration or communion, and is liturgically the same as the Ante-Communion Service or "Table Prayers," such as are frequently used on Good Friday and Easter Even. A similar service is still held at Milan on these days, and used to be frequent in Latin Christendom when for some reason or another the consecration of the Eucharist was not permitted or thought undesirable. Among ourselves this rite was grievously abused for a long time by being held on certain Sundays when nothing ought to have

hindered the consecration of the Eucharist. In the East the Liturgy is still regarded as an act of thanksgiving of such a festal type that it is considered unsuitable for the stricter fasting days. The language of the Divine Liturgy is Slavonic, an archaic form of Russ, and one of the finest liturgical languages in existence.

The Liturgy is always celebrated with music, incense, and full ceremonial, *low Mass* being regarded as an irreverent Roman innovation. A priest may not celebrate more than once, nor may an altar be used more than once, on the same day.

The people are extremely devout in church. Their usual posture, even for the act of communion, is standing, but at other solemn moments they kneel or prostrate themselves. They are expected to know the service by heart, and in consequence prayer-books are not used. The Liturgy is not celebrated daily except in large town churches, but saints' day celebrations are extremely frequent. Sacramental Confession and fasting are indispensable preliminaries to Communion. Only the most devout communicate every month, but infants often receive more frequently.

It is hardly necessary to say that the Choir Offices, important as they are, do not bulk so largely in Orthodox eyes as they do in our own. In an Orthodox catechism, quoted earlier, only two pages are devoted to them, while nearly nineteen are taken up in describing the Liturgy.

There are seven services which comprise the Divine Office, namely:—(i) Matins, (ii) Lauds with Prime, (iii) Terce, (iv) Sext, (v) None, (vi) Vespers and (vii) Compline. For the convenience of the Faithful, these seven services are divided into three groups. The first group, consisting

of Matins and Lauds with Prime, is recited in the early morning; the second, consisting of Terce and Sext, precedes the Liturgy; and the remaining offices are said in the evening. This grouping and continuous recitation of several services is no novelty in the West. As is well known, our own offices for Morning and Evening Prayer are combinations of several pre-reformation services. Morning Prayer contains elements derived from the old offices of Matins, Lauds, and Prime; Evening Prayer is a similar compilation from Evensong, or Vespers, and Compline. The Russian services, like our own, chiefly consist of psalms, verses, and prayers, but are ordinarily without the long lections from Holy Scripture with which we are familiar. They are extremely lengthy and complicated. The long-drawn rhetorical prayers and anthems are the natural expression of the poetical Eastern temperament, and contrast strongly with the brief concise collects of the more prosaic and business-like West.

III

FAITH AND PRACTICE

WE have now to consider the theological position of the Russian Church. It is hardly necessary to say that the Nicene Creed is accepted without reserve, in its proper and ancient sense, as the authorized summary of the Christian Religion. There is, indeed, no *Filioque* clause, that is to say, the words "*and the Son*" are not added to the words "*proceeding from the Father*" in the clause relating to the Holy Spirit, a phrase to which all Easterns take exception as being both an irregular addition to the Creed, and also patient of a heretical interpretation; but when "*Filioque*" is explained to be equivalent to "*Per Filium*," they are satisfied that our doctrine is orthodox, although they still strongly object to the interpolation. At a recent conference in Petrograd between an English theologian and a number of Russian divines, the chairman (the Bishop of Kholm) authorized the statement, that "though the Russians and the English differ in the wording of their respective formulas, yet the Conference had, after hearing explanations, concluded that the two Churches are agreed as to the substance of the teaching concerning the Eternal Procession of the Holy Ghost." We are safe, then, in stating that the "*Filioque*" is not an insuperable bar to inter-communion.

CLAIM TO REPRESENT THE WHOLE CHURCH

Turning from the general statements of the Creed to their practical application, we are confronted with the important claim that "the Orthodox Churches throughout the East and North alone now form the One Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church of Christ, the pillar and ground of the Truth." This statement is quoted from a pronouncement made in 1895 by the Greek Patriarch in reply to an encyclical letter from Pope Leo XIII, and may be taken as an authoritative statement of Orthodox conviction. Such a claim, seriously made, is of course a great convenience in dealing with internal affairs. It is also a grave hindrance in negotiating with other religious bodies. When you believe that each item in your religious system has the august sanction of the Universal Church, you cannot treat the smallest part of it as an open question, admitting of an alternative solution. With the most charitable motives in the world you can only say, "This is the way. Walk ye in it." That is why all advances towards the Roman Church are doomed to failure so long as Rome remains as she is. She can never really be party to a policy of mutual explanations and concessions. She is always a judge extending clemency to a delinquent.

PRACTICAL MODIFICATION

Theoretically the Orthodox Communion is in the same position, but in practice it is somewhat less rigid and uncompromising. This is no doubt due to the fact that, unlike the modern Roman Church, Orthodox Christendom is from one point of view a federation of independent national

churches, which, although united in fundamentals are not necessarily agreed in every ecclesiastical detail. For example, the Russian Church is in communion with the Bulgarian Exarchate, which at Constantinople is regarded as schismatic. It is noteworthy that since the Schism of 1054, the Easterns, in spite of their exclusiveness, have never claimed œcumenical rank for any of their later councils. I believe that they regard a general council as impossible since the "falling away" of the West. This is illogical, but a hopeful sign. Both among Russians and Greeks one finds men of hard and narrow outlook, but in Russia at any rate there are a much greater number who are slow to condemn those who differ from them. It would be well for us if all in our ranks were as charitable as they.

THE SACRAMENTS

The whole Orthodox Communion claims, not without some justification, to preserve the doctrine and practice of the Undivided Church. It accepts Seven General Councils and Seven Sacraments. It appeals both to Holy Scripture and to Tradition, but is perhaps insufficiently alive to the fact that traditions can and do sometimes vary, and themselves require to be tested from time to time. In the Longer Catechism of the Russian Church a Sacrament is defined as "a holy act through which grace, or in other words, the saving power of God, works mysteriously upon man." The function of each sacrament is thus briefly stated: "In Baptism man is mysteriously born to a spiritual life. In Unction with Chrism (*i.e.*, Confirmation) he receives a grace of spiritual growth and strength. In the Communion he is spiritually fed. In Penance he is healed of spiritual diseases,

that is, of sin. In Orders he receives grace spiritually to regenerate, feed, and nurture others, by doctrine and Sacraments. In Matrimony he receives a grace sanctifying the married life, and the natural procreation and nurture of children. In Unction with oil he has medicine even for bodily diseases, in that he is healed of spiritual."

BAPTISM AND CONFIRMATION

Orthodox doctrine with regard to Baptism and Confirmation differs in no important respect from that of the West, but there are differences in the mode of administration. In the case of Baptism the child is completely immersed three times in the font. For centuries the Easterns denied the validity of Western Baptism, but they do so no longer, thanks to the Russians, who first refused to condemn Baptism by affusion, and then induced the other Orthodox Churches to follow their example.

Confirmation, which takes the form of anointing with chrism, follows immediately upon Baptism. It is administered by the parish priest, but the oil must have been previously blessed by the bishop. It is admitted, however, that Confirmation by the laying-on of a bishop's hands with prayer is permissible as an alternative mode. The only really serious difference between East and West with respect to Confirmation consists in our divergent views as to the permanence of the gift bestowed. Western Christendom numbers the rite among those sacraments which confer *character*, and forbids its repetition. The Orthodox Church, on the contrary, holds that the grace of Confirmation may be extinguished by heresy or schism, and repeats its administration when the offending party returns to the unity of the Church.

THE EUCHARIST

It is taught that in the Eucharist "the believer, under the forms of bread and wine, partakes of the very Body and Blood of Christ, to everlasting life," language which can be paralleled from our own formularies. The word *transubstantiation* is authoritatively used by Easterns, but many Russian theologians disapprove of it and maintain that their own corresponding term, *presushchestvlenie*, excludes "the coarse metaphysics of the schoolmen." The representative theologian Khomiakoff, writing of the attitude of the Russian Church in this matter, says: "She does not reject the word 'Transubstantiation'; but she does not assign to it that material meaning which is assigned to it by the teachers of the Churches which have fallen away."

It is held that the consecration is effected not by the recital of the Words of Institution, but by the invocation of the Holy Spirit which comes later in the Canon and is worded thus: *Send down thy Holy Spirit upon us and upon these gifts set forth, and make this Bread the precious Body of thy Christ, and what is in this Cup the precious Blood of thy Christ, changing them by thy Holy Spirit.*

The Eucharist is also the Christian Sacrifice wherein the Holy Gifts are offered to God as the memorial of the Sacrifice of Calvary. Strictly speaking there is but one sacrifice, for both on the Cross and on the Christian altar the same High Priest, our Lord Jesus Christ, offers the same oblation of his Body and Blood for the sins of the whole world; yet the mode of offering is different, for on the Cross Christ offered himself visibly, suffering pain and death, while in the Eucharistic Sacrifice he offers himself

A FINE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY IKONOSTAS

The side entrances are not shown

invisibly through the agency of his ministers without the shedding of blood.

Those who are present at the Holy Liturgy without communicating have their share in its benefits by faith and prayer, and by the commemoration of Christ's death and passion.

The Blessed Sacrament is reserved upon the altar for the sole purpose of communicating the sick and dying, but, strangely enough, no notice is taken of it when it is not being used for that end. I remember a Russian priest who was explaining to me the ornaments of his altar taking the pyx into his hand and opening it to show me the contents. I told him that no Anglican priest would dream of exhibiting the Holy Things in that way, but he simply replied, "You are going to be a priest, and in Russia we have a rule that every priest must be ready to help another; so I show you our arrangements." Orthodox tradition knows nothing of extra-liturgical devotions before the Blessed Sacrament. It is held to be most improper to use the Holy Gifts for any purpose not specified by our Lord.

Throughout the Orthodox Church leavened bread is used in the Liturgy. The Western use of unleavened bread for this purpose is one of the practices which the more pedantic Easterns vigorously condemn. With the single exception of the Armenian all the schismatic Oriental Churches agree with the Orthodox custom in this matter.

HOLY ORDERS

The Orthodox Church knows no other doctrine of the Christian ministry than that implied by the term *apostolical succession*. The commission bestowed by Christ upon the

Apostles was by them transmitted to their successors the bishops, who in their own generation provide not only for the continuation of their own office but also for the succession of the lesser orders of ministers. To the bishops alone belongs the power of ordination, which is exercised by the laying-on of hands with appropriate prayer in the Sacrament of Holy Orders.

Emphasis is laid on the representative character of the ministry. A priest is simply the local organ of the Universal Church, and thus his personal character and intellectual attainments do not affect the validity of his ministrations. If, however, he should offend against the unity of the Church either by way of heresy or schism he ceases to represent the Church, and the grace of priesthood becomes extinct in him. Accordingly it is open to a rigorous Eastern to maintain that the Orthodox Church alone possesses a valid ministry and valid sacraments; but as a matter of fact this claim is not pressed. The only point deserving special attention is that the Easterns deny the indelibility of Holy Orders. There have been instances of the re-ordination by them of Western priests, both Roman and Anglican, who have been received into the Orthodox Communion, but such instances are not likely to recur. The validity of Roman ordinations is now admitted, and the only hindrance to the acknowledgment of our own is the lack of an authoritative statement of our position in the matter. They are willing to take us at our own valuation.

THE POWER OF ABSOLUTION

With regard to the Sacrament of Penance, it is clearly taught that God alone is the source of all forgiveness, but

that such forgiveness is normally bestowed through the channel of priestly absolution, pronounced after private confession. The Greek absolution is couched in the following terms: "May God, who pardoned David, through the prophet Nathan, when he confessed his sins . . . may that same God, through me a sinner, pardon ☩ thee everything in this world, and cause thee to stand uncondemned before his awful Throne." The Russian rite, after a prayer for the penitent, contains the following absolution: "May our Lord and God, Jesus Christ, through the grace and compassion of his exceeding Love, forgive thee my son N. all thy transgressions; and I, an unworthy priest, by the power that is given unto me by him, forgive ☩ and absolve thee from all thy sins in the Name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost. Amen." Here again we note a fairly close resemblance to the absolutions provided in the Prayer-book *Order for the Visitation of the Sick*, and the Roman Ritual.

HOLY MATRIMONY

Probably the most unsatisfactory feature of Russian religion is the lax attitude of the Orthodox Church with respect to the Sacrament of Marriage. On the whole Western Christendom has consistently taught that marriage is indissoluble except by death, and this is undoubtedly the true Christian tradition. Whatever Easterns may say on this point, their practice is to permit divorce and re-marriage, not once only, but several times if so desired. Unfaithfulness to the marriage bond, an incurable disease, insanity, and desertion are among the grounds for which divorce may be allowed. It is fair to add that the ecclesiastical

courts require the most conclusive evidence before an appeal is granted. The fact remains, however, that divorce and remarriage are permitted.

UNCTION OF THE SICK

The Sacrament of Holy Unction (S. James v, 14-15) is administered to the sick for both bodily and spiritual healing. Contrary to Western custom the oil is consecrated not by a bishop, but by the priests who are assembled for the anointing. As a general rule there is only one priest to bless the oil and administer the Sacrament. Any person who is seriously ill is regarded as a fitting recipient. He need not be *in articulo mortis*.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD

We turn to the important and highly controversial subject of the *Communion of Saints*. With regard to the Faithful Departed, it is interesting to observe that the Russians entirely reject the *doctrina Romanensium* respecting Purgatory. "The souls of the righteous are in light and rest with a foretaste of eternal happiness . . . They may be aided towards the attainment of a blessed resurrection by prayers offered in their behalf, especially such as are offered in union with the oblation of the Bloodless Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of Christ." The author of the Greater Catechism, the Metropolitan Philaret, wrote, "There is no such thing as Purgatory, in which souls have to pass through fiery torments in order to prepare them for blessedness . . . There is no need of any other kind of purification when 'the Blood of Jesus Christ cleanseth us from all sin.'" It should not be deduced from this quota-

tion that the Russian Church rejects all ideas of purification and progress after death. She denies, however, that the Departed undergo penal sufferings *as a satisfaction* for sins committed on earth.

THE SAINTS

Invocation of Saints is practised throughout the Orthodox Communion, but with important qualifications. It is taught that the Saints themselves are only saved by grace, and therefore we cannot be helped by their merits but only by their prayers. Further, the Saints, and even Blessed Mary herself, are prayed for in the Liturgy. The Communion of Saints is a reality to the Russian. He is united with them in spirit, separated only in body. He asks them to pray for him as simply and naturally as we desire each other's prayers, for the Saints are his personal friends. Nor is this invocation confined solely to canonized saints. In just the same way a little child commends itself to the loving intercessions of its departed mother. Surely there is something in this beautiful and comforting practice which its opponents have not yet realized. One often wonders what some of our people mean when they solemnly affirm their belief in the Communion of Saints.

For the "all-holy, spotless, most highly blessed and glorious Lady the Theotokos and ever-virgin Mary" our orthodox brethren have a great devotion. In addressing her with the object of obtaining the benefit of her prayers they use language which, it must be admitted, sounds extravagant, to say the least, in Western ears. Here again, however, one must make allowance for the poetical Eastern temperament, for no instructed Orthodox Christian would

dream of seriously ascribing to Mary any office or prerogative which belongs properly to her Divine Son.

THE USE OF IKONS

We conclude this necessarily brief statement of Orthodox doctrine with some observations on the use of ikons or sacred pictures.¹ It is much too readily assumed by those who know little of the Eastern temperament that the outward marks of reverence and respect paid to these representations are practically indistinguishable from idolatry. Ignorance and superstition in this respect can indeed be discovered among them, but no exception can be taken by any broad-minded person to the authoritative teaching of the Russian Church on the point. It is plainly stated that the use of ikons would be idolatrous "if we were to make gods of them, but it is not in the least contrary to the Second Commandment to honour ikons as sacred representations, and to use them for the religious remembrance of God's work, and of his Saints; for, when thus used, ikons are books, written with the form of persons or things instead of letters."

¹ The use of statues is forbidden, but carvings in high relief are common.

THE CELEBRATED IKON OF OUR LADY OF KAZAN
From a copy in gold and enamel in the author's possession

IV

THE HIERARCHY

AMONG the most interesting types to be seen in Russia are the parish priests. In consequence of some old laws, now obsolete, the ministry has tended to become an hereditary profession, and even to-day probably the majority of candidates for Holy Orders are the sons of priests or deacons. The rest are almost exclusively drawn from the poorer classes. As a result, the Russian clergy often know by experience the hardships and temptations of the poor, and consequently their ministrations are the more sympathetic. I was told, with how much truth I cannot say, that the peasantry would not appreciate a priesthood recruited from the higher walks of society. On the other hand, the clergy are largely out of touch with the *Intelligentsia* or educated classes, among whom a shallow agnosticism is fairly common. Yet these peasant priests of Russia are by no means devoid of refinement. Descended, as a rule, from a long line of priests, they exhibit greater intelligence, superior morals, and even a more distinguished appearance than do their social equals among the laity. While it would be untrue to say that scandals do not occur, still the great majority of them live respectable and useful lives. Preaching is rare, but the clergy are able to exert a beneficent influence by means of the Confessional, by reading instructive books to their people, and by that close personal touch derived from

living a clean and simple life under the same conditions as the peasants themselves.

POVERTY OF THE CLERGY

Many evils arise from the fact that the clergy are so poorly paid. Usually a country living is endowed with a piece of arable land which the priest either cultivates himself or lets to a neighbouring farmer. It is rare, however, that his income is enough to live upon, and in consequence he is obliged to exact payment for all private ministrations. Where such a system is in vogue the possibility of serious abuse is obvious unless the clergy are men of high moral character. Apostolic poverty is doubtless an excellent condition of life if a priest is unmarried, but when he has family responsibilities it tends to destroy that independence which is necessary if he is to do his duty with courage and impartiality.

A MARRIED PRIESTHOOD

All parish priests and deacons must be married men. It is sometimes stated that when a clergyman's wife dies, he must resign his living and enter a monastery. This rule, however, if rule it be, is certainly not rigorously enforced. The only restriction invariably binding on a priest or deacon under such conditions is that he may not re-marry. He must be "the husband of one wife," and he must have married that one before his ordination. In consequence, one of the first duties of a seminarist who has completed his course is to find a wife. Should he fail in this, the bishop will find one for him from the family of some deceased clergyman. It is said that these clerical marriages

are amongst the happiest in Russia. A married priest may, of course, become rector of an important church, but he cannot rise above the rank of a *blagotchinny* or rural dean, for all the higher offices in the Church are filled by the "black" or monastic clergy, who are, of course, celibates. There have been instances, however, of the elevation of a widower to the episcopate.

TRAINING OF THE CLERGY

There is a widespread impression among us that the Russian priests are badly trained and instructed. This is certainly untrue, at any rate so far as their professional training is concerned. The course of instruction provided in a Russian seminary would bear very favourable comparison with that given in the majority of our theological colleges. What is often lacking in a Russian priest is rather that general education which we esteem so necessary before a student goes on to specialize in some particular branch of knowledge.

Seminaries admit pupils between the ages of fourteen and sixteen for a course of study lasting about six years. The most promising students can pass on to a *Spiritual Academy*, a sort of ecclesiastical university where the instruction given is of a very high order. On leaving the Academy, a student is either certified to be matriculated, a candidate, or a magistrant. To become a magistrant it is necessary for him to submit a thesis, and to be prepared to discuss the subject with his examiners.

If a seminarist on leaving college is too young for Holy Orders, he sometimes works in a parish as *ponomar* or reader until he has reached the canonical age. He is

then appointed to a benefice, and is ordained deacon and priest with only a few days' interval between the successive promotions. If, however, he intends to become a monk, he goes straight from college to the monastery. In the Orthodox Communion the Order of Deacons is regarded as a permanent vocation and not as a mere temporary apprenticeship for the priesthood, though, as a matter of regularity, every aspirant to the higher order must first be ordained deacon. Only the very poorest parishes are without a *dyákon*, for his participation in the Divine Liturgy is essential if it is to be properly rendered. In this way the Orthodox Church utilizes the services of men who lack the special gifts required for the priesthood, and yet are desirous of serving God in the sacred ministry.

THE MONASTIC ORDERS

The rich variety of religious orders existing in Western Christendom finds no parallel in the Orthodox Church, where there is but one, the contemplative order of S. Basil. An active order for women is now in existence, but this is only an experiment and so far lacks official authorization. The Russian monasteries have often proved themselves in the past to be glowing centres of devotion and patriotism. It is said that nowadays the flame burns more dimly, but of this I am not able to judge, having visited so few. There are three¹ Lavri, or greater monasteries, of which the metropolitans of Moscow, Kieff, and Petrograd are the abbots, ruling their houses by a *namyestnik* or prior, as did the prince-bishops of Durham in the Middle Ages.

¹ I am informed that there is now a fourth lavra at Pochaëff in Volynia.

THE TROITSKY LAVRA

The Monastery of the Holy Trinity, near Moscow

The Troitsky or Trinity Lavra in the neighbourhood of Moscow is the most famous of these. I referred to this monastery and its glorious past in the chapter dealing with the religious history of Russia. Thousands of pilgrims from all parts of Russia visit its glittering shrines every year. It is the national sanctuary.

ORGANIZATION

Owing to the centralization of authority in the Holy Synod, a Russian bishop has nothing like the independence of our own Fathers in God. He is more like a government official, administering his diocese like a civil governor, with the assistance of his consistory court, a body composed of monks, secular clergy, and laymen. The secretary is a layman who has a great deal of power. Responsible to this court are the rural deans, who in turn supervise the parochial clergy in their districts. It is worthy of remark that the title of *archbishop* is a purely honorary one, conferred in recognition of good service. A bishop receives the distinction without necessarily vacating his see or extending his jurisdiction. He remains just as he was before except for the greater dignity of his style. The higher title of *metropolitan* is also purely honorary, for the provincial system as we know it does not exist in Russia. There are three metropolitans, those of Petrograd, Kieff, and Moscow. These prelates, together with five or six others, constitute the Holy Synod. The Tsar is represented at its meetings by a lay procurator, who has a great deal more power than is good for the Church. He cannot interfere in purely spiritual matters,¹ but he can direct ecclesiastical policy into channels

¹ Such interference would probably cost the Tsar his throne.

favoured by the State. It is said that much harm has been done by this means in the past. The Synod owes its existence, as we have seen, to an arbitrary act of the civil power in Russia, but its authority is acknowledged not only by the Russians but also by the four Eastern patriarchs. Unhappily some of the other Orthodox states, Greece for example, have followed the Russian model. The restoration of the patriarchate is much to be desired, and is not altogether beyond the bounds of possibility.

CLERICAL TYPES

To conclude this part of our subject, I venture to summarize some sketches of Russian priests given by Professor Pares in his interesting and impartial study¹ of the national institutions. These outlines are all the more valuable as the professor writes from a purely non-ecclesiastical standpoint.

Town priests.—*A.* is a rural dean, a quiet, able man, intelligent, interested in social reform, a temperance worker and an optimist. *B.* is rector of a poor town parish, a grave, simple man, not very hopeful in his estimate of popular morality and religion, but doing his best to improve matters. *C.* is a man of considerable intelligence, who deplores the poverty of the clergy and the inequalities of clerical stipends. He considers that the servile attitude of the poorer priests to their flocks should receive official attention, and that each poor parish should be linked to a richer one. He has a poor opinion of the Government's temperance reforms (this was in 1905), but considers honesty among peasants to be improving.

¹ "Russia and Reform," by Bernard Pares.

Country priests.—*D.* is “like a great bear,” big, kind, awkward; he welcomes the spread of education, which is much needed. *E.* is a priest of the more ignorant type, inclined to be argumentative, but he considers that education is working wonders among the peasants, and is sufficiently courageous to express disapproval of the procurator of the Holy Synod. *F.* is alert and enthusiastic, full of hope for the future of Russia. In his opinion the position of the clergy is improving. “He discusses the possibility of an understanding with the English Church. In dogma there is hardly any difference, except the *Filioque* . . . Of course, all questions of ceremony must be settled separately by each branch of the Universal Church.” He advocates more technical schools and country factories. *G.* is a simple and kindly old man, interested in the daily lives of his people. He reads to them a good deal, especially the Gospel, “because that is the foundation of everything,” and gives lectures with lantern illustrations. He considers education and enterprise to be advancing everywhere. *H.* is “a jolly man with twinkling eyes, who talks very freely.” He considers that the peasants are improving in most directions, though illegitimate births are more frequent. Pilgrimages are on the increase.

Monks.—*J.* is an elderly archimandrite, big and powerful. He has no difficulty in believing popular legends. Once he wore chains for a year, but his superior made him leave them off, as “they cut into his shoulders and he fainted in church.” In his opinion, the monastic life is less rigorous than it used to be. *K.* is an ordinary monk, “singularly gentle and simple.” He is absolutely ignorant of life in the world. He finds plenty of work in the monastery, prayers,

cleaning churches, carpentry, the painting of ikons, and so on.

Those superior persons who love to inform us that priests (especially foreign priests) are invariably opposed to the progress of education and enlightenment may find something to surprise them in these little sketches of typical Russian ecclesiastics. As for the higher clergy we have the following testimony¹ from Bishop Herbert Bury, who supervises the Anglican chaplaincies in North and Central Europe. "My experience of the archbishops and bishops of the Russian Church is that they are *real saints*. There is no other name that befits them."

It would seem, then, that the Russian clergy will bear favourable comparison with those in other lands usually considered to be more enlightened.

¹ Speech delivered at Church House, Westminster, 22 October, 1914.

V

THE LAITY

To Western Europeans Russia is a land of enigmas; and perhaps the greatest enigma of all is the Russian peasant. Many of his own race do not understand him. How, then, shall we? Our knowledge of him is gained from the narratives of supercilious tourists, or the grotesque sketches of popular novelists. And it is not of the real peasant that we read in these works. He has suffered many things. He will not bare his heart to every passer-by. Only to those whom he can trust will he reveal his true character, his real thoughts. That is why Mr. Stephen Graham¹ has shown us a new type of Russian peasant, a type of which we had never dreamt before. But it is not a new type in reality. It is the peasant as he is, and Mr. Graham has succeeded in piercing the veil because he loves the Russian people, and the people know it. Their portraits, as he paints them, are singularly attractive, and absolutely convincing. Under these pictures can be written "Their sins, which are many, are forgiven them; for they loved much."

THE PEASANT AS HE IS

We who have spent a few months, a few years, perhaps, in Russia bring home many tales of theft, drunkenness, and

¹ See particularly his remarkable and beautiful book, "With the Russian Pilgrims to Jerusalem."

lust. Our tales are probably true, but our inference is not. We have not lived *with the people*, but in hotels, flats, or great country houses. We never came into contact with them except in the newspapers, and newspapers thrive on the *abnormal*. They do not describe for us the patient endurance, the simple kindly life of the average peasant. It is as if a Russian should form his impression of England from the police court narratives in our daily press, as, indeed, many of them do. Let us then frankly acknowledge that we do not know this people, and turn to Mr. Graham for guidance. These are human beings whom he describes, men and women who are like big children, with all the faults and all the graces of children. Undoubtedly they are self-willed, undisciplined, credulous, not knowing when they have had enough to eat and drink, and yet, with all this, warm-hearted, generous, a great rough family of brothers and sisters. If we regard them from an educated twentieth century standpoint, we shall be doing them an injustice. They are just emerging from the Middle Ages. It is not Russia's fault that her children are backward, any more than it is Britain's virtue to have a large navy. The institutions of both countries are conditioned by their geography. Before we pass sentence on Russia let us bear in mind the difficulties of a vast territory with a small sea coast, and with few large towns and hundreds of thousands of remote country villages, with suspicious and unsympathetic neighbours, a land peopled from West to East by many different tribes—Teuton, Sláv, and Mongol—and by combinations of all three, with a climate of violent extremes, and imperfect means of communication. Let us ask ourselves what we can in fairness expect from this country and

TWO OLD PEASANTS OF THE UKRAINE

its people. The answer is not doubtful; yet there are those who abuse the Russian people for being only a little more sober, a little less ignorant, than were our great-grandfathers. We, who as a nation have almost forgotten the name of God until we require something at his hands, we decry the Russian peasant to whom religion is the salt of life because he does not always act up to his profession—but he makes no profession. He knows that he is a sinner, ignorant, weak, and sorely tried, and he knows that God is merciful. So he goes to Confession and the Liturgy for his needs, he reads the Gospels (translated for him into dozens of dialects and tongues), and in his declining years he goes on pilgrimage to the Holy Land, enduring great hardships on the way, to trace the *Via Dolorosa*, and bedew with his tears the “Life-giving Tomb.”

Intemperance is the great national failing. Partly to fortify their ill-nourished bodies against the intense winter cold, and partly to escape from the monotony of their surroundings, the peasants consume large quantities of vodka, a fiery and injurious spirit made from the potato. The decision of the Tsar to abolish for ever the State sale of vodka, which was a Government monopoly, may be expected to achieve much in liberating the moujiks from the curse of intemperance, and those other evils which inevitably follow in its train.

THE REALISM OF RUSSIAN RELIGION

The facts of the Christian Revelation are far more real to the peasants than they are to us. This is due, I think, to two things. In the first place, the simplicity of their

outlook on life, coupled with the gift of a vivid imagination, enables them to accept without reserve what they are taught by priests as simple as themselves. And, secondly, this realism is the outcome of instruction imparted *through the eye*. The universal use of ikons in church and home results in an almost first-hand acquaintance, so to speak, with New Testament events. These events are present experience, not past history. Moreover, the Christian institutions are clearly distinguished from their official guardians. A priest may sometimes be inefficient or unworthy of respect, but since he is only regarded as a mouth-piece, a sort of machine for administering the Sacraments, his inefficiency does not affect the reverence with which his flock regards the Church, her faith and practice. The laity, too, are guardians of religion, and if necessary they will forcibly compel a priest to do his duty. There is, however, a drawback to this zeal. It will be rather a hindrance to reform, for the more ignorant people regard every minute detail even of their ceremonial, every word of the Liturgy, as of Divine origin and appointment. We have seen that a great schism was caused when the Patriarch Nikhon made some slight reforms in these respects.

THE INTELLIGENTSIA

And yet in many ways reform is necessary if the educated classes are to be held by the Church. These have devoured the works of the great French and German philosophers. They know all the arguments against Christianity, but very little of the evidence in its favour. At present the efforts made to retain their allegiance are totally inadequate. When a man's fundamental religious ideas are in the melting pot

it is no argument to remind him of the teaching office of the Church. He must first be convinced that the Church ought to exist. There is, then, a great need of apologetic framed to meet modern difficulties. It remains to be seen whether this will be forthcoming. One thing, however, is certain. The religious instinct is firmly implanted in the heart of every true Russian, and sooner or later it bears fruit. Even those who profess to believe nothing are usually more than ready to discuss religion. It is said that this atheism is in very many cases only due to the eager desire of the *Intelligentsia* to appear as Western and up-to-date as possible, and that many of those who adopt this attitude continue to practise their religious duties in private. At any rate the great fasts of the Church are still observed with much strictness in all grades of society. I would like to quote here the words of a distinguished writer upon Russian subjects, and one, moreover, who as a Roman Catholic, adopts an antagonistic attitude towards the Orthodox Church. After a rehearsal of its defects, he¹ says: "Apart from all this, religion in Russia, as I have tried to point out, whether believed or not, will always remain a part of patriotism; and as long as there is a Russian nation, there will be a Russian religion at the core of it." To its people Russia will always be *Holy* Russia, and woe to the invader who profanes its altars and desecrates its sacred soil! In the hour of danger all politics and pose are banished, and it is a nation in arms which marches with the watchword of "Tsar, Church, and People."

¹ The Hon. Maurice Baring, in "The Russian People."

CHURCH GOING

I have already described the technicalities of public worship. It remains to say something of the spirit pervading the worshippers. As preaching is so rare, a Russian has no misapprehension as to the purpose for which he goes to church. He does not go to sit and listen, but to stand and pray; he is there not so much to *get something from* God as to *give something to* God, the homage of his whole being. In a word, he understands the meaning of worship as our own people, for the most part, do not. A remarkable characteristic of the peasant is his capacity for sustained worship. The services are exceedingly long and wearying, yet it is said of him that the more they are prolonged the more his devotion increases. This devotion finds an outlet in frequent prostrations, crossings, and salutations to the sacred ikons. Commenting upon this demonstrative piety, the Abbé Gustave Morel,¹ who was a close student of Russian religion, writes: "After having considered all this exaggerated, I am beginning to regret the necessity which forces me to maintain a more complete reserve. One feels that all these gestures do good to the soul; the religion of the ignorant moujik is worth more than that of the Protestant scholar, who professes to worship God in the spirit only."

PATRONAL FESTIVALS IN TOWN AND COUNTRY

The services are almost everywhere well attended, though the clergy lament the influence of town life in this and other respects upon the peasants. I give, however, my impressions of two important festivals, one in Petrograd and

¹ Cf. "L'Abbé Gustave Morel," translated by E. J. Dredge.

the other in our little village of Tchoutovka. On both occasions the churches concerned were observing their patronal festivals. Let me begin with the service at the Kazansky Cathedral, one of the most popular churches in the capital.

The exterior of this stately building, with its noble colonnade of one hundred and thirty-six pillars, suggests the basilica of S. Peter at Rome. The interior is well lighted and almost Western in appearance. The great ikonostas is of solid silver, and extends right across the church from wall to wall. Inset are some splendid golden ikons adorned with priceless gems. On the eve of the feast I found the church crowded to suffocation for what would correspond to First Evensong. Leaving religious considerations on one side this service was remarkable as an example of solemn pageantry. The gleaming ikonostas half veiled with the clouds of incense, the stately mien and rich vestures of the officiating prelates, the glorious singing of the choir, all these things expressed the prodigality of Russian devotion. As for the congregation, probably nowhere else in Europe could one behold a more heterogeneous gathering of human beings engaged in common worship. Tightly wedged together stood shop assistants and military officers in full uniform, artisans and princes, children and adults, all craning their necks to catch a glimpse of the great golden ikons ablaze with diamonds and tapers. At intervals I felt myself touched on the shoulder, and on turning received a taper with the request to pass it on to the shrine. Sometimes instead of the taper it was a few kopecks with which to purchase one on behalf of a worshipper at the rear of the church. The heat was intense and the atmosphere insupportable, but everyone was

in a good humour. It took me at least twenty minutes to squeeze through to the exit when I wished to leave. On the next day, the festival itself, people had taken up their position in the church as early as six o'clock in the morning, and it was hopeless to attempt to enter. At the close of the service, however, when the great congregation poured into the street, one would have thought an imperial reception to have just terminated, such were the numbers of splendid carriages and gorgeous officials issuing from the precincts.

Of a much humbler character was our village festival. The most distinguished ecclesiastic present was Bátushka Nikolai, a former rector of the parish. The little old wooden church boasted no silver screen, no jewelled ikons; but it may be that the simple hearts of our peasants in the Ukraine held a treasure richer far than these. When I reached the church, the service had already commenced. From the daïs reserved for our party from the "Big House" I could command a good view of all that was going on. Around us was a solid mass of humanity, of which only heads and shoulders could be seen. The royal doors were open, and inside were three or four priests and deacons performing the ceremonies of the Liturgy. Bátushka Nikolai, wearing a chasuble of cloth-of-silver, was the celebrant, and his clear tenor voice could be clearly heard chanting the prayers. To the front of us stood the wives of the visiting clergy. Mátushka¹ Varvara Vasilievna, overcome with emotion, embraced Mátushka Marfa Ivanovna, and both crossed themselves several times. Everyone was very devout, very interested, and very happy—even the people thronging the

¹ *Mátushka: Little Mother*: a title of respect given to a clergyman's wife.

TCHOUTOVKA

THE OLD WOODEN CHURCH

THE ORNAMENTS OF THE ALTAR

steps outside, though they could see nothing of the service. At the close of the Liturgy, the clergy with crosses, banners, and incense, went singing in procession three times round the outside of the church, followed by practically the whole congregation. During the last circuit prayers were said before the three chief entrances, and then, not having prayed enough, the people went inside again to kiss the "Life-giving Cross" and the ikons.

PILGRIMAGES

Russia is pre-eminently the land of pilgrimage, and this outline of popular religion would be incomplete without some account of one of its most touching features. Which of us has not at some time or other felt in his heart the desire to pray at the holy places in Jerusalem? It is hard to reconcile this longing with our modern ideas about religion. We know that on earth we can never be nearer to Jesus than when he comes to dwell in our hearts in the most holy Sacrament of the Altar. We know that in Jerusalem itself, swarming with hucksters and tourists, he is only a dim memory, that cold-blooded investigators challenge the authenticity of most of the holy sites: and yet the longing remains, for the heart refuses to be ruled by logic. We can to some extent, then, understand the Russian peasant's love of pilgrimage. For a more complete appreciation of his motives we must go to a Russian writer.¹ "The pilgrim's ideal," he tells us, "is a sweet feeling of the heart in prayer. Follow his life from birth and you will find that these sweet feelings began in the village church when he was a child.

¹ V. N. Khitroff; a quotation in Mr. Graham's book mentioned above.

Ordinary life dulled them, caused their repetition to be infrequent, and he began, without knowing why perhaps, to visit neighbouring monasteries. There he caught his sweet vision again. But the ordinary things of life defeated him again, and even at the monasteries he *felt* seldom. So he went further afield. He went to far shrines, to Solovetsk, to S. Seraphim. He left home and went from village to village, and from monastery to monastery, ever further and further till he reached the holiest place on earth—the Holy City, and Golgotha, where the redemption of mankind was accomplished. Further on the earth there was no-whither; it seemed that the soul had found what it wished—though it had not. Satisfied for the time he returns to his native land, but again in a little while appears once more the unconquerable wish to go to that place where were experienced such sweet minutes. In that, it seems to me, is contained the psychology of the Russian pilgrimage.”

VI

PERSONAL IMPRESSIONS

FROM my diary I select a few narratives which will serve to illustrate and vivify what has already been written. The following extract is a little sketch of our parish priest, a broad-minded and earnest man about thirty-five years of age. Very soon after my arrival in his parish he came to call on me, and with the help of another Russian friend we had a long conversation. He was much interested in the Church of England, and asked me many intelligent questions about the training of our clergy. Could they marry, and were they regarded with respect? What were our churches like? And our music? To the best of my ability I played and sang to him some typical hymns, including some set to plainsong melodies. It was a little disappointing to find that he preferred tunes of the slum mission type rather than the severer ecclesiastical music. The former he thought "very Russian." Batushka Johann, like most of his brethren, was a good musician, and had an excellent tenor voice. He could play four or five instruments, including the violin and piano, and promised to arrange a concert for me when I returned his call. On the day fixed for this event I went to the Church School, where he was living during the erection of a new parsonage, and here I met his young wife and little daughter. After we had exchanged greetings the concert began. The orchestra consisted of the two school-

masters, who played the balalaika (a Russian guitar), the Mátushka, who played the violin, her brother and sister, who played mandolines, and the priest himself, who presided at a small harmonium. There was quite a long programme, during which the Bátushka played several other instruments. Practically all the music was Russian; there were sad but beautiful folk-songs, stirring marches, gay and tuneful dance music, and finally, as a very great compliment to me, the programme terminated with "God save the King," which had been specially learnt for the occasion.

During the performance I glanced round the room, which was spotlessly clean and neat. The floor was painted, and covered here and there with grass mats. On the walls hung large coloured portraits of the Tsar and Tsaritsa, with a gorgeous picture of their coronation. The furniture consisted of a large plain table, with several chairs and stools, a low couch, another small table which served as the Bátushka's desk, and in the corner of the room a small shrine, covered with ikons and books of devotion; here, too, were several of the little smooth loaves of leavened bread, stamped with religious characters, which the Eastern Church uses for the Holy Communion. A small triangular piece is scooped out of each little loaf, and the remainder is presented as a mark of honour to the principal person present at the service. Father Johann was always extremely glad to see me at his church, and wrote a special note on one occasion in which he thanked "the much respected Englishman" for coming to the service, and apologized for the singing of the choir, which, however, was considerably better than that of the average village choir in England.

His eagerness to meet my wishes in every way was on one

TCHOUTOVKA

FATHER JOHANN
The Parish Priest

THE VILLAGE ALTAR
Seen through the Royal Gates

occasion a source of great embarrassment to me. I happened to be passing the church just as a funeral procession headed by cross-bearer and bannerers was setting out for the cemetery. Thinking myself unnoticed I prepared to photograph the scene, when to my horror Bátushka Johann called a halt and the whole party, including the mourners, posed for their portraits with the corpse in the centre!

A PEASANT WEDDING

The following is an account of a wedding scene at Oosman, in the Government of Tamboff. The favourite day for marriages in this district is October the first, the fête day of the province. On this occasion (1911) seventeen couples were united, three pairs at a time. The brides wore brightly coloured frocks, consisting of red petticoats and wide-sleeved bodices of orange yellow silk, decorated with red and green trimmings. Round their necks were rows and rows of large coloured beads. Their heads were crowned with flowers or with a fantastic *kokoshnik* (tiara) and a small veil. Their hair was parted in the middle, tied back and left loose until after the service. The bridegrooms wore rough leathern coats, mostly dyed black, ornamented with coloured stitching and edged with white fur. Their hair, according to custom, was well greased, and without a ruffle. Bride and bridegroom alike wore a large coloured handkerchief fastened by one corner to the wrist. The godparents took the place of the parents, standing behind the couples and occasionally giving a furtive lick and smoothe down to a refractory lock. A portable altar covered with faded cloth-of-gold was placed in the centre of the church, and the couples, holding lighted tapers in their right hands, stood

close by with stolid and expressionless faces. After some prayers, the priest required them to express their willingness to marry, and then presented them with a cup of wine from which each couple drank, in token that they would share in like manner the joys and sorrows in store for them. After some more prayers, the priest gave them the marriage crowns, which were placed on their heads. Then joining their hands they were led round the altar three times by the priest. Until the third round there was yet time for either party to withdraw. More prayers were then said, and finally the newly wedded pairs, having formally embraced, retired to the vestry where some ancient non-religious customs had yet to be observed. Among these the chief was the dressing of each bride's hair. The godmother separated it into plaits, using only her fingers, and after carefully smoothing every hair into position wound them about the bride's head. After marriage it is a great disgrace for a woman to be seen dressing her hair, or even to wear it in a long plait; but no unmarried peasant woman, however elderly, may abandon the single plait. It is etiquette for a bride to display great sorrow on leaving her father's home, and doubtless her cries are often not altogether artificial, for she knows that her future life will probably be a round of drudgery and toil.

A MONASTERY NEAR LOUBNY IN POLTAVA

In the neighbourhood of Loubny on a well-wooded eminence stands the large Monastery of the Ascension, which is well worth a visit. We drove there one day in a *droshky* or hired carriage, and spent a very interesting afternoon. The road is very hilly and circuitous, and is often thronged with pilgrims, a particularly numerous class in

THE MONASTERY OF LOUBNY

THE BELL TOWER AND CHURCH

THE ROYAL GATES

SHRINE OF S. AFANASE

Russia. The monastery is described as of the second class, and dates from 1620. It was formerly extremely wealthy, and probably is so to-day, though the present monks lament the glories of the past. At the top of a steep road stands a large free hostelry for pilgrims. The monastic buildings, which are very extensive, are on the left-hand side of the road. Ascending a flight of wooden steps we passed through a wide archway, over which is a tall white bell-tower. A short avenue, paved with large stones, leads straight towards the great church, which is almost surrounded with the other monastic buildings. The church is not specially remarkable, except perhaps in that the ikonostas is more gaudy than usual. The royal gates in this screen are of solid beaten silver, and there are several tall standard candlesticks and exceptionally large sanctuary lamps of the same precious metal. But of all the treasures in the building, that of which the monks are most proud is the body of S. Afanase in its great silver shrine. This Athanasius was a patriarch of Constantinople, who, in 1647, retired to the monastery to end his days in peace. We were shown in the grounds the ancient tree beneath which the holy man used to sit reading and meditating upon the Scriptures. Here one day he was found dead, and his body was carried into the church and there buried, clad in the patriarchal vestments. Many years later, when the present shrine was built, the body was exhumed, and discovered to be as whole and incorrupt as at his death, and in the same state it certainly remains, from whatever cause, to this day. On our return to the church, a small glass window in the shrine was opened so that those of us who felt inclined might kiss that part of the robes which covers his hand.

The body is still in a sitting posture, just as it was discovered under the tree two hundred and fifty years ago. The saint has a reputation for working miracles, and all sorts of medals, crosses, and ikons are sold at cost price by the monks to the pilgrims who seek the saint's blessing. For a sum equal to a shilling I bought a small ikon of the saint, and several beautifully carved little wooden crucifixes made by some of the monks.

One of my Russian companions had a brief conversation with a lay brother who was cleaning the church. He informed us that there are at present about one hundred and thirty monks and novices in the establishment, of whom a very large percentage are laymen. They are of all ages, the youngest being mere boys. I saw one of these last climbing a tree to look at a bird's nest.

THE ALEXANDRO-NEVSKAYA LAVRA, PETROGRAD

This vast monastery was founded by Peter the Great in 1710 as a fitting shrine for the warrior saint, Alexander Nevsky, Prince of Novgorod. The quadrangle is several acres in area, and is surrounded with buildings, including the principal and the lesser churches, a large and valuable library, and a theological college. As I entered the great church a service had just terminated, but a dozen or two of worshippers remained behind with an old monk, who led their devotions before the silver shrine of S. Alexander. A monk of the Eastern Church wears a black cassock and a sort of brimless top hat with a black veil hanging down behind. Otherwise his habit appears to be no different from that of the ordinary clergy.

It was in this church that the four Anglican bishops

who visited Russia in 1912 were invited to witness the consecration of a bishop according to the Orthodox rite. The following account of the ceremony, which lasted four hours, appeared in a contemporary English newspaper:—
“Two metropolitans and eight other bishops took part, magnificently vested in cope and mitre. Perhaps the two most impressive features of the service were the ceremony of presenting the new bishop at the close with his pastoral staff, and the ordination by him of a deacon immediately on his own consecration as bishop. In all the ordination rites of the Russian Church provision is made that the newly ordained deacon, priest, or bishop, as the case may be, shall then and there in the face of the congregation proceed to exercise his new prerogative. The only trace of this in our own Ordinal is the reading of the Gospel by the new deacon.”

It should be mentioned that the Lavra possesses a famous cemetery, where some of Russia's greatest men lie buried. Of them all, perhaps the best known in England is Tchaikovsky, the musician. On the morning of my visit a military funeral was in progress. Half a battalion of infantry was drawn up in the yard. Within one of the smaller churches lay the body of the deceased soldier, evidently an officer of high rank. The coffin was still open (as appears to be the usual custom), and was surrounded with flowers and lights. At the head and foot, and on either side, stood four priests, and on the right the mourners, each holding a lighted taper. One of the clergy with a sonorous bass voice intoned the prayers on a remarkably deep note. As he finished, a concealed male-voice choir commenced a most beautiful hymn, but so softly that

at first it was hardly audible.¹ In all Holy Russia, the land *par excellence* of choral singing, the chant as I heard it might perhaps somewhere have been equalled: it could not have been surpassed. At the close of the office, the mourners handed their tapers to attendants, and mounted the bier to look their last on the departed, most of them blessing the body with the sign of the Cross. Then came several loud blows of a hammer as the lid was placed upon the coffin, an unpleasant and disturbing feature of the service, and the cortége proceeded to the place of burial. I noticed that the vestments of the clergy were not black as in the west, but golden or white, as also were all the other equipments of the funeral.

A CONVENT IN PETROGRAD

Near the Moscow Gates of Petrograd stands the Novo-Devichi Monastir, a large convent, which I was enabled to visit by the kind offices of an English lady resident in Petrograd. The nuns are well known for the excellence of their ecclesiastical craftsmanship, which includes the painting of ikons, and it was to see them thus engaged that we went to the convent. Unfortunately this was impossible, as it was the Feast of the Kazan Mother of God and the work-rooms were closed. We were admitted to the church of the convent, where a place was found for us in a small railed enclosure. Thirty or forty nuns were standing motionless in prayer in various parts of the building. Their habit was similar to that of the monks we saw at the Lavra, even in respect to the strange head-dress. Now and then one of

¹ Cf. English Hymnal, 744, as a specimen of Russian hymns for the Departed.

them passed noiselessly up to the Kazan ikon, and after triple prostration and many crossings kissed the ikon, and then returned to her place. Meanwhile the church was filling with fresh arrivals, both of nuns and of lady visitors, and finally the Igúmenya or prioress entered, accompanied by two sisters bearing lighted tapers. The nuns then took their places two and two for procession, and began to sing a psalm to a simple chant as they moved out of the church. They were followed by the taperers and the Igúmenya, who carried the ikon of the feast. We passed round the quadrangle, in the centre of which a fine new church was nearing completion, and entered a temporary chapel, where stood row upon row of young novices in plain, close-fitting dress and *puritan* caps of black straw. Each novice wore her hair in a long single plait. When the chapel was filled a priest appeared and began the office. The deacon's part was undertaken by a tall, pale nun, who read interminable prayers or lessons in a deep, strong voice, very like a man's. At long intervals the community sang responses in four parts very beautifully. Finding the unintelligible service rather wearisome, we left after about half an hour. Outside there was a pandemonium of bells of all sizes and descriptions, the harsh vibrating boom of the largest mingling with the gay rhythmic jangle of the smaller ones. A long tram ride brought us back to the heart of the city. On the way an incident occurred which illustrated the kindness and generosity of the average Russian. A poor woman with a babe in her arms was asked for her fare, and on searching for her purse discovered that it had been stolen, together with the whole of her scanty earnings. She burst into a torrent of weeping, for this sum

was all she had to support her family. At once nearly everyone in the car produced his purse and made her a small present, so that in the end she had more than she had lost. Some of those who helped her were nearly as poor as she.

THE CHURCH OF THE RESURRECTION

Perhaps the most gorgeous building in Petrograd is the Church of the Resurrection.¹ Its exterior is ornamented with wonderful mosaics, and with cupolas of bronze, and of white, blue, and green enamel. Within, every inch of the walls and pillars glows with soft colours. On all sides mosaics depict venerable saints and ecclesiastics. There are numerous ikons studded with jewels, and the ikonostas is of Italian marble enriched with jasper and topaz. At the west end of the building, a baldachino or canopy of solid jasper, supported by four pillars of the same stone, is hung about with silver lamps. One looks to see what precious object it overhangs—only two or three square yards of dusty cobble stones, but they are stones which have been splashed with imperial blood. This is the spot where Alexander II., the Tsar-Liberator, was assassinated on March 13, 1881. One of the most enlightened of Russian emperors, he did much to improve the lot of his suffering people, but he was unable to accept the programme of the Nihilists, and he paid for his refusal with his life. The Church of the Resurrection is his memorial, and a splendid monument it is. One evening when passing along the Nevsky Prospekt, I heard its great bell vibrating through the damp atmosphere, and turned down by the canal bank to see the interior by artificial light. It presented a truly

¹ See Frontispiece.

magnificent appearance. The ikonostas was well lighted, and the jasper gates were opened, for a service was in progress. One could see the beautiful mosaics of the eastern wall from floor to towering roof. The prevailing tints were rose and old gold. A venerable priest and his attendant deacon, both of them wearing vestments of shimmering cloth-of-gold, were within the screen censing the altar, which was lighted by the large seven-branched candlestick. A concealed male-voice choir chanted with perfect expression the exquisite harmonies of an Orthodox hymn, while the old priest, descending into the body of the church, passed from shrine to shrine to offer prayer and incense at each.

THE DUST OF KINGS

The Church and Fortress of SS. Peter and Paul were built by Peter the Great. The church, which has been the burial place of the Russian Tsars since his time, exceeds in sombre magnificence any of the other buildings I visited. Within, to the right of the screen, are the tombs of Peter the Great and the two Catherines. In the body of the church lies all that is mortal of Alexander III. For the most part the tombs are altar-shaped, and composed of white marble. A brass cross is inlaid along the surface of each, together with a plate bearing the name of the illustrious dead. On some tombs are set small imperial crowns resting upon cushions, the whole worked in solid brass and containing tiny lamps fed with holy oil. In the gloom of the great building the effect of this decoration is very striking. An annexe has in recent years been added to this church, and here the lesser royalties are now interred. The

walls of the church are hung with silver wreaths, and some sanctuary lamps of beautiful enamel-work hang before the sacred pictures. It is a shrine worthy to receive the ashes of Peter the Great, the Reformer and Autocrat of All the Russias.

VII

FOREIGN RELATIONS

WE have already noted the Greek origin of the Church in Russia, its early subordination to the patriarchs of Constantinople, and its emancipation, claimed in 1448 and finally ratified in 1589. We have now to consider what may be termed the *foreign policy* of this great national church, dealing in the first place with its attitude towards the parent see. There are few more pathetic spectacles in the modern ecclesiastical world than the once illustrious patriarchate of Constantinople. Historically the second see of Christendom, formerly rivalling that of Rome in power and majesty, it has shrunk almost to the dimensions of a petty archbishopric since the Ottoman Turks occupied south-eastern Europe.¹ The present Patriarch, Germanos, whose distant predecessors could claim even more adherents than could the Roman bishop, presides over less than 150,000 Orthodox Christians in Turkey, together with the Greek communities along the coast of Asia Minor. From the various national churches formerly within the jurisdiction of his see he receives nothing more than deference and respect, and even this purely honorary distinction is sometimes imperilled by the Pan-Hellenist intrigues of his advisers. We may say then that the Russian Church is in partnership on practically equal terms with the Oecumenical Patriarchate, balancing

¹ The Turks stormed Constantinople on 29 May, 1453.

with its immense size and importance the ancient prestige of its ally. It is a fascinating speculation to forecast the ecclesiastical results of a Russian occupation of Constantinople.

The Russian Church is also in full communion with the other three Eastern patriarchates of Antioch, Alexandria, and Jerusalem, with the national Churches of Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria, Roumania, Montenegro, and Cyprus, and with the Orthodox Churches in Hungary and the Bukovina. This group constitutes the Orthodox Communion. The Russians, are, of course, more numerous and influential than all the rest put together, a fact of the highest importance when we remember their more liberal temper and deeper spirituality.

It should be borne in mind, however, that this intercommunion does not preclude the various provincial churches from developing along their own lines within reasonable limits. More than once the Russians have acted with considerable independence, and particularly we may note their attitude towards the important Council of Jerusalem, sometimes known as the Synod of Bethlehem, which met in 1672. The acts of this synod have been pithily described as "legislation in a temper." In consequence of the heresy taught by the Greek patriarch Cyril Lukar, the Easterns were acutely conscious of the fact that their boasted orthodoxy was compromised in the eyes of the West. The Synod met to vindicate their faith. In order to disarm hostile criticism its pronouncements were couched in Roman phraseology, and to some extent embodied ideas which had hitherto been confined to Western Christendom. When the decrees of the Synod were received in Russia,

MODERN IKONOSTAS
In the Church of S. Saviour, Moscow

such expressions as were open to objection on this account were either omitted from the Russian version or else deliberately modified. In this way the Russians guarded themselves against accepting supposed materialistic conceptions of Purgatory and the Mass.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS ROME

In spite of a certain unwilling respect for the Roman Communion, the attitude of the Orthodox Church towards Latin Christendom is one of decided hostility. It rejects as pernicious novelties the papal claims to infallibility and universal supremacy, though in happier circumstances it would not refuse to the Pope his ancient position as first among the patriarchs. The conception of an absolute ecclesiastical monarchy is entirely alien to Orthodox ideas, and could never be accepted by Easterns without stultifying their whole position. They believe that the Holy Spirit dwells in the whole body of the Church, guiding it *as a united whole* into all truth. Hence their appeal to the witness of the early *undivided* Church in defence of their tenets.

Other doctrines rejected by them, wholly or in part, are the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady, the Treasury of Merit, Indulgences, and the penal sufferings of the Holy Souls in Purgatory: but a catalogue of such differences would not adequately explain the causes of disunion. The truth is that there is a wide difference between the Roman and Eastern temperaments. Rome is monarchical, practical, logical, precise; the Easterns are oligarchical, ultra-conservative, poetical, loth to define. We can picture how different the later history of Christendom might have been

if unity had been maintained, and had East and West in virtue of that unity corrected each other's failings and augmented the common virtues. As a matter of history the centrifugal tendencies in each communion have had free play since the schism. The intrusion of Latin prelates with Eastern titles into Orthodox spheres of jurisdiction has greatly increased the antipathy between the two bodies. Another cause of ill feeling is the mortification with which the Easterns have witnessed the aggrandisement of the great apostolic see of the West, while their own leading patriarchate has dwindled to comparative insignificance under Mohammedan rule. And finally they cannot forget the barbarous conduct of the Western Crusaders who in 1204 sacked Constantinople, then a Christian city, murdered the Byzantine emperor, and placed a Latin patriarch¹ on the throne of S. John Chrysostom. It requires extraordinary faith to believe that the two largest sections of Christendom will be again united, but more than once efforts have been made towards the attainment of that end. The most notable of these was the Council of Florence (sometimes termed of Ferrara) which met in 1438-9. The Council was attended by delegates from the East, upon whom the strongest pressure was imposed by their emperor in the hope that he would receive military assistance against the Turks in return for an acknowledgement of the papal supremacy. The Orthodox envoys, cajoled, bribed, and threatened by friend and foe, conceded most of the Roman contentions,² and the

¹ It is an apt commentary on the mediaeval attitude towards the Roman claims that the Latin patriarchs of Constantinople at once began to intrigue for the aggrandizement of their see at the expense of the Papacy.

² See Appendix C.

agreement was ultimately repudiated by the East as a betrayal of Orthodox principles.

ATTITUDE TOWARDS PROTESTANTISM

Protestantism, by which is understood excessive individualism in religion, the denial of the teaching office of the Church, and the depreciation or rejection of the Sacraments, is regarded by the Orthodox Church as a mutilated form of Christianity which cannot be justified either from Holy Scripture or from the practice of the early Church. It is a complete novelty devised at the Reformation, and the Roman Church is reproached for causing it by her extravagant claims and mediaeval corruptions.

RELATIONS WITH THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION

For many years it has been understood by the Easterns that the Church of England and her sister churches stand on a very different footing from that of the Protestant bodies, but little more than this is known of us except by a comparatively small band of scholars. Latterly the growing intercourse between Great Britain and Russia has led to a revival of mutual interest in the two national churches. I use the word "revival" because, as the late Bishop John Wordsworth reminded us, "ever since the beginning of the seventeenth century, when we must date the establishment of direct intercourse between the reformed Church of England and the Eastern Patriarchates, there has been a constant and a pleasant sense of brotherhood engendered in the converse of intelligent men, quite irrespective of the common ties of Church policy, or agreement on doctrines

and practices, which must be the more formal elements of any alliance."

The story of this intercourse is too long to recount here, but it has culminated in the formation of two societies, one in Russia and the other in England, which work systematically and in co-operation for the restoration of intercommunion. The English society,¹ which is, of course, an unofficial organization, has a large and growing membership, and its activity is considerable. It is very important to note that the Russian society has the official approval of the Holy Governing Synod (dated January 1912), without which, indeed, it would not be permitted to exist. Among its honorary members are the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the Bishop of London, six Russian archbishops, and, until his death later in 1912, the Metropolitan Anthony of Petrograd. The programme of the Russian society includes an annual course of lectures by some eminent English theologian, and the translation into Russ of important English theological documents.

Formerly our interest in the Eastern Orthodox Church sprang from a purely devotional motive, the earnest desire to fulfil our Lord's prayer that all his servants might be one. Of late years, however, this interest has been intensified by the situation in America and the colonies, where large communities of Orthodox immigrants have settled among our own people, frequently without either churches or priests to shepherd them. It was plainly necessary that steps should be taken to meet their needs, and already much has been done in that direction by the local Anglican bishops and clergy. Numerous instances could be given of this charit-

¹ The Anglican and Eastern Association.

TCHOUTOVKA

GIRLS DANCING ON THE FEAST OF S. BORIS

PEASANTS RESTING AT MID-DAY

able care for our Eastern brethren, which is generally undertaken with the approval of their own ecclesiastical authorities. Thus, we are told of a Canadian priest specially charged with the care of a Russian community in Nova Scotia, for whom he celebrates the Orthodox Liturgy every Sunday in the absence of a priest of their own rite. In the parish of the Advent, Philadelphia, where the original inhabitants have been completely replaced by Sláv and Armenian immigrants, the Anglican rector provides Sunday masses for each section of his parishioners, using the proper national rite in each instance. In Madagascar and in parts of South Africa where there are Greek settlers, it is customary for them, with the approval of their patriarch, to seek the ministrations¹ of our priests in those districts. These are but typical instances of what is taking place in many parts of the New World.

In Orthodox countries there are English chaplaincies in most of the large towns, so that at present there are few of our people who are in need of like care. It is extremely probable, however, that the number of British subjects in the Russian Empire will greatly increase in the future. The urgent necessity of coming to some definite understanding with the Orthodox authorities with regard to all these cases is sufficiently obvious. Equally obvious is the unfortunate fact that neither we nor they are at present in a position to do so.

¹ Not only Baptism, but also Confession and Holy Communion.

VIII

INTER-COMMUNION

ALL thoughtful Anglicans will sympathize, at any rate in principle, with those who are working for the restoration of communion with the Orthodox East, but experience has shown it to be necessary to state what sort of understanding is desired. There are those who jump at the conclusion that the Byzantine Liturgy and ceremonial are to be foisted on our staid British congregations, or else that pious Orthodox are to be edified with the Book of Common Prayer and the XXXIX Articles. Such notions are, of course, preposterous. It is indeed certain that we shall be asked to state authoritatively what is the meaning of sundry ambiguous phrases in our formularies. It is quite probable that we shall be asked to remedy the dislocations in the English Liturgy. But an attempt to impose uniformity of rite and ceremony could only end in disaster. Such an attempt will not be made.

Again, since the object desired is the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer for unity among his followers, it is plain that inter-communion with the East, when it is achieved, must not be regarded as an opportunity for attacking the Roman Church. Having healed one wound in the Body of Christ, we shall not desire to make more grievous another, and that the worst. We shall rather rejoice that in many respects the way will be clearer for advance towards that more complete unity for which every devout Christian is bound to pray.

Our gaze is directed eastward at present because in that quarter lies the greatest promise of success. We believe that in spite of all hindrances success will crown our efforts, because they are in accordance with the Divine Purpose, but it would be foolish to minimize these hindrances. Let us consider what they are.

We have to admit that the greatest obstacle to inter-communion is our own unsatisfactory condition. This can best be illustrated by the following extract taken from a letter which I received in 1912 from a Greek archpriest. He writes: "Unfortunately it is not the question of Anglican Orders that separates us, my friend. This could be settled easily. It is the need of unity in your own faith. The Anglican Church is proud of being comprehensive—like Noah's Ark. In it every colour of belief can be found. Still, all these colours and subdivisions are sheltered under the name 'Anglican Church'; *but the Truth is One*. The Anglican Church has either to bring her parties into agreement, and be united in herself, or else give us her High Church fraction to deal with alone."

Some of us would do well seriously to consider these words. It will be noted that the validity of Anglican Orders presents no grave difficulty. *The great obstacle to reunion is that indiscriminate comprehensiveness so often proclaimed to be the glory of the Anglican Communion*, the very characteristic which we have been told is to assist us so greatly in working for Christian unity. No doubt there is a reasonable comprehensiveness, but we do not possess it. A church which could include such diverse individuals as (let us say) Father Stanton and Bishop John Wordsworth is worthy of respect, for beneath their superficial differences were certain great

principles to which both men faithfully adhered: another denomination which counted among its adherents, Dean Stanley and Bishop Ryle of Liverpool, of whom the same could be said, would be equally consistent: but how can one defend a church which acknowledges all four types as her legitimate offspring? A house divided against itself cannot stand, and a society which cannot issue a clear statement of its principles has no justification for its existence. When the Church of England has decided what she stands for she will be in a better position to mediate in a divided Christendom. It is neither possible nor desirable that the united Christendom for which we pray should be a gigantic reproduction of the Anglican Communion with its faltering witness and its internecine strife. The Church exists to bear witness to the truth, not to provide facilities for theological discussion.

It is of no avail that some of us point out that our formularies are patient of a Catholic interpretation. What our Orthodox brethren desire is to be officially assured that the Catholic interpretation alone is accurate. When this is done reunion will be in sight. At present it is beyond the horizon. I should like to emphasize the fact that the validity of Anglican Orders is not a serious difficulty. Although no final official pronouncement has been made by the Orthodox hierarchy on this subject, it is safe to say that their best historians and divines regard the Roman allegations as *not proven*. In other words they are satisfied that Barlow was a bishop; that he consecrated Archbishop Parker in Lambeth Palace Chapel on 17 December 1559, using a sufficient rite in so doing; and that as a matter of *history* the ministerial succession from the apostles has been in consequence pre-

served by us to this day. Why then do they hesitate to say so? Because they are unwilling to consider this matter apart from the rest. Let my Greek correspondent speak once more. "An official acknowledgement of your Orders by our Church means that she sanctions the most extreme Protestant views of the Low and Broad Churches (*sic*) from whom the High Church is inseparable." The Easterns have a theory, unknown in the West, that even when Orders are administered by a competent minister with proper form and matter, they may nevertheless be invalid if those concerned hold heretical opinions. They are waiting, therefore, to see whether the Church in England will succeed or not in purging herself from the "extreme Protestant views" with which many of her children are infected. If this is done, the formal recognition of Anglican Orders will follow as a matter of course. This point of view may be incomprehensible to us, but it is that of men who wish us well, and desire to draw closer to us. We should bear it in mind.

OBSTACLES ON THE ORTHODOX SIDE

It has already been said that the restoration of communion with the Easterns could not be permitted to make us Orientals. We should continue to worship, believe, and practise our religion as Catholics of the West. Herein lies the possibility of further difficulties, for by allying themselves with us the Orthodox will have to lay aside some of their weapons against Rome, and this the more bigoted among them will probably be unwilling to do. We have to deal with others besides the comparatively broad-minded Russians.

Again, if we have to produce evidence of our orthodoxy, it is only right that the Easterns should be asked to explain

their extremely unsatisfactory attitude with regard to the indissolubility of Marriage. They will not find it a simple matter.

Once more, the exaggerated nationalism of the Orthodox Christians is a constant menace to the preservation of unity *among themselves*. Each of the national churches, especially in the Balkan peninsula, is so completely identified with the ideals and temperament of its members that even when a purely political dispute arises it can only maintain ecclesiastical peace with the greatest difficulty. The expulsion of the Turks from Europe will probably result in some permanent settlement of boundaries, both secular and religious, as a result of which we may hope that racial animosities and intrigues may cease to endanger the unity of the Church in those turbulent districts.

It is plain, then, that on the Orthodox side also there are serious obstacles in the way of a united movement towards communion with us. Many years must elapse before all these difficulties are smoothed away. To some they may appear insuperable, but let us remember that there is much to encourage us.

We shall recall that the visible unity of Christendom is the revealed will of our Lord. "*Neither for these only do I pray, but for them also that believe on me through their word, that they all may be one, even as thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, that they may be also in us; that the world may believe that thou didst send me*" (S. John xviii, v. 20, R.V.): and again, "*They shall be one flock, one shepherd*" (S. John x, v. 16). It is possible for sinful man to hinder for a while the fulfilment of the Divine Purpose. It is not possible that he should be able to thwart it altogether. The Holy Spirit

still works patiently for this end, and the firstfruits of his work may be seen in the almost universal desire to terminate the miserable divisions of Christendom. In every denomination there are men who are praying, studying, working for Unity in co-operation with God, and their number steadily increases. It is treason to anticipate failure.

Among ourselves the steady progress of the Catholic Revival gives ground for hope. The idol of indiscriminate comprehensiveness has already been shaken upon its pedestal by the Kikuyu Conference and its sequel. It may be that ere long it will lie shattered before the Ark of Truth. With special reference to the Eastern Church, we recall with deep thankfulness the action taken by the Lambeth Conference of 1908.

"This Conference is of opinion that it should be the recognized practice of the Churches of our Communion (1) at all times to baptize children of members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion in cases of emergency, provided that there is a clear understanding that baptism should not be again administered to those so baptized; (2) at all times to admit members of any Church of the Orthodox Eastern Communion to communicate in our churches when they are deprived of the ministrations of a priest of their own Communion, provided that (a) they are at that time admissible to Communion in their own Churches, and (b) are not under any disqualification so far as our own rules of discipline are concerned." (Resolution 62.)

This charitable offer has been accepted in many parts of the world, as we have already seen. It cannot but be productive of good results.

In Russia the official approval of the supreme ecclesiastical authority has been given to the society previously mentioned

whose objects are “(a) to cultivate feelings of mutual goodwill, mutual understanding, and to promote closer touch between the members of the Orthodox and Anglican Churches; (b) to sustain and encourage action tending to re-union of the Anglican Church with the Orthodox.”¹

In Palestine there has been of late an immense improvement in our relations with the Orthodox hierarchy, which were formerly the reverse of cordial. A great deal of offence had been given by the schismatic action of the Church Missionary Society’s agents, who openly endeavoured to “convert” the native Orthodox Christians from their proper ecclesiastical allegiance. The appointment, in 1887, of the late Bishop G. F. Popham Blyth as our representative in the Holy City marked the beginning of a new era, for the Bishop devoted all his energies to the suppression of proselytism and the establishment of better relations with the Orthodox prelates. It would be difficult to exaggerate the value of his work in this direction, which gained for him and for the Anglican Communion the respect and esteem of his neighbours. On at least five occasions since 1901, the Bishop’s patient tact and devotion enabled him to prevent the secession of large numbers of Syrians from the Orthodox Church to the English congregations in Palestine. At all times he upheld the true Catholic position of the Church he represented, so that the Easterns “now regard the English Church *as a Church*, and not, as before, merely a Protestant sect with a most unfortunate appetite for proselytizing.”² Throughout his episcopate, which ended in

¹ The cautious wording of the second object should be noted.

² A quotation given in the Annual Report (1914) of the Anglican and Eastern Association.

1914, Bishop Blyth was hampered by the opposition of the Church Missionary Society, but there is good reason to hope that his successor, who is pledged to continue his policy towards the Orthodox Church, will be able to count on the Society's adherence.

There is, then, much to encourage us in the great task we have set ourselves to accomplish with God's help. We desire to break down the walls of partition which human sin has set up within the One Fold of Christ. We require much patience, earnest prayer, wider charity, above all deeper penitence for our own shortcomings if we are to succeed; but no effort is too great for such an end. The mystical Body of Christ, which is his Church, is still nailed to the Cross, its functions impeded, its vitality lowered. The nails of ignorance and prejudice must be removed that East and West may meet. The Body must be healed with the sweet spices of love and clothed with the white robe of holiness, for the restoration of Christian unity will be the Church's resurrection to a new life.

APPENDIX A

RUSSIAN ORTHODOX MISSIONS

WE have recently been told by the Bishop of Oxford that the Russian is "an exceedingly efficient missionary church." In view of the general impression to the contrary it would be well to produce some evidence in support of the Bishop's statement. The following facts are gathered from a little book with the above title, written by Father Eugene Smirnoff, chaplain of the Russian Embassy in London.

It appears that contemporary with the Catholic Revival in England there has been a remarkable growth of missionary activity in Russia. As a counterblast to Mohammedan proselytizing in the Asiatic provinces of the Empire, a devoted band of priests volunteered for service in Siberia, where their truly apostolic labours met with considerable success. So much interest was aroused at home that in 1870 the *Orthodox Missionary Society* was founded by the Metropolitan Innocent of Moscow, who himself had laboured with brilliant success in the Far East for forty-four years before his elevation. The Society, which has considerable administrative powers, is governed by a central committee at Moscow, and has some fifty sub-committees in various large towns of Russia, charged with the duties of fostering enthusiasm and collecting funds for the Society's objects.

Some idea of the magnitude of its task may be gathered from the fact that there are about twenty millions of non-Christians among the Tsar's subjects, the majority of whom are Mohammedans. These are scattered sparsely over an enormous expanse of territory. The nomadic habits of the Siberian tribes, the endless diversities of race, custom and language, together with aggressive Mohammedan opposition, combine to present a problem of extraordinary difficulty and

complexity. These questions receive serious and scientific study. The centre of this branch of the work is Kazan, whence, also, more than one and a half millions of translations of the Holy Scriptures and of the Liturgy have been issued in some twenty different languages, ranging from Arabic and Persian to Tatár and Ostiak-Samoyede. The work of translation is not the least of the difficulties. Most of the tribes have neither grammar nor alphabet. Others have two distinct dialects, the literary and the vernacular. Some tribes have no words to express the ideas of *love* and *judgment*. There are even some who have no word either for *bread* or *body*. In spite of all these hindrances the number of converts averages about four thousand each year.

In addition to the Siberian missions there is the very efficient Orthodox Church in Japan, now practically autonomous, and also a smaller mission in Northern China.

It will be seen, therefore, that the charge of apathy in spreading the Faith so frequently levelled against the Orthodox Church is not in accordance with fact.

APPENDIX B

THE CENTRAL PORTION OF THE *ANAPHORA*, OR CANON OF THE MASS

LITURGY OF S. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM

After the Sursum Corda, Preface, Sanctus, and the Benedictus qui venit, the Priest continues in a low voice:

O Lord thou Lover of mankind, we also with these blessed powers cry aloud and say, Holy art thou and All-holy, thou and thine Only-begotten Son and thy Holy Spirit. Holy and All-holy art thou and great is the majesty of thy glory: Who didst so love thy world as to give thine Only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth in him should not perish but have everlasting life.

Who having come and having fulfilled the whole law for us, in the night wherein he was betrayed, or rather gave himself up for the life of the world, took bread into his holy, stainless, and undefiled hands, and having given thanks he blessed, hallowed, and broke it, and gave it to his holy disciples and apostles saying (*aloud*) **Take, eat: this is my Body which is broken for you for the remission of sins.**

The Choir: Amen.

The Priest continues in a low voice: Likewise after supper he took the cup saying (*aloud*) **Drink ye all of this: This is my Blood of the New Testament which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.**

The Choir: Amen.

The Priest, privately: Wherfore remembering this saving precept and all that has been done for us, the Cross, the Tomb, the

Resurrection on the third day, the Ascension into Heaven, the Session on the right hand, and the second and glorious coming again (*aloud*) **We offer unto thee thine own of thine own in behalf of all and for all.**

The Choir: We hymn thee, we praise thee, we give thanks to thee, O Lord, and make our supplications unto thee, O our God.

The Priest, in a low voice: And we offer unto thee this reasonable and bloodless sacrifice, and pray, beseech, and supplicate thee **Send down thy Holy Ghost upon us and upon these gifts set forth—**

Here are interposed acts of penitence and praise, at the close of which the Deacon says: Bless, Master, the holy bread.

The Priest continues privately: **And make this bread** ✠ ✠ ✠ **the precious Body of thy Christ—**

The Deacon: Amen. Bless, Master, the holy cup.

The Priest: **And what is in this cup the precious Blood of thy Christ—**

The Deacon: Amen. Master, give the blessing.

The Priest: **Changing them by thy Holy Spirit,—**

The Deacon: Amen, Amen, Amen.

All prostrate themselves in adoration.

The Priest: That they may be to those that partake for the restoring of the soul, the forgiveness of sins, the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, the fulfilment of the kingdom of Heaven, for confidence towards thee, and not for judgment or condemnation.

Moreover we offer unto thee this reasonable service on behalf of those departed in the faith, our ancestors, fathers, patriarchs, prophets, apostles, preachers, evangelists, martyrs, confessors, virgins, and every just soul made perfect in the faith, (*aloud*) especially the most holy, stainless, highly blessed and glorious Lady, the Mother of God and Ever-Virgin Mary,—

The Choir sing a hymn in honour of the Mother of God.

The Priest continues in a low voice: For Saint John the Prophet, Forerunner and Baptist, the holy, glorious, and illustrious Apostles, for Saint N. whose memory also we celebrate, and for all thy saints,

through whose prayers, O God, look favourably upon us. And remember all those who have departed this life in the hope of resurrection to life eternal, and give them rest where the light of thy Countenance shines upon them.

He goes on to pray for the living.

* * * * *

Note.—The sentences printed in italics should not be regarded as rubrics. They are my own insertions intended to simplify the Canon, which is otherwise extremely complicated and difficult to follow.

APPENDIX C

THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, 1438-9

THE last of the three reunion councils met at Ferrara in 1438, but was later removed to Florence in consequence of an epidemic. Neither the Pope nor the Eastern prelates really had in view the interests of Christendom. Each party merely desired to gain such advantages from reunion as would meet its own immediate needs.

For some years past the Western Church had been scandalized by the abuses of the papal court, and had resolved on reform. The Pope was declared to be subject to the authority of general councils, an assertion which struck at the heart of the Roman autocracy. This claim was naturally repudiated by Pope Eugene IV, who sought to strengthen his position against the reforming Council of Basle by securing the adherence of the Church in the East.

Meanwhile the very existence of the Byzantine Empire was being threatened by the Turks under Murad II. The Emperor, in his extremity, sought military help from the West, and in return was prepared to acknowledge the Pope's jurisdiction over the Eastern Church. Under these circumstances the Council assembled at Ferrara, but the Orthodox delegates showed such unwillingness to admit the papal claims that the discussion lasted for fifteen months. Ultimately they submitted to pressure, and some sort of compromise was effected, as a result of which the schism was healed, at least on the surface. The Eastern delegates acknowledged that "the Pope is the Sovereign Pontiff, the Vicar of Christ, Shepherd and Teacher of all Christians, to guide and rule the whole Church of God, *though without prejudice to the rights and privileges of the other Patriarchs.*"

This concession is really of small significance when one realizes how the Greeks would define "the rights and privileges of the other Patriarchs." The union which ensued was a fiasco almost from

the first. The Pope was unable to send adequate military assistance, and on May 29, 1453, Sultan Mohammed II stormed Constantinople at the head of 200,000 troops. The Emperor Constantine Palaiologos died fighting bravely outside the walls of the city, and with him fell the great empire of the East. Naturally the Orthodox Christians considered that the Pope had taken advantage of their necessities to extort concessions from them, and had then declined to fulfil his own obligations. They proceeded to repudiate formally the Council of Florence, and so terminated the artificial union which had existed since 1439.

INDEX

- Absolution, Forms of, 33.
 Academy, Spiritual, 39.
 Afanase, Shrine of S., 59.
 Alb, 17.
 Alexander II, 64.
 Altar, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 22, 24, 30.
Anamnesis, 22, 85.
Anaphora, 22, 85.
 Anglican Church, Relations with, 3,
 71.
 and Eastern Association, 72.
 Orders, 32, 76.
Antiminsion, 17.
 Apostolical Succession, 5, 16, 31, 76.
 Archbishop, 41.
 Archimandrite, 18, 43.

 Baptism, 28, 29.
 Basil, Liturgy of S., 23.
 Order of S., 40.
 Basle, Council of, 88.
 Bassian, Archbishop, 9.
 Bethlehem, Synod of. *See* Jerusalem.
 Bishops, Origin of, 5.
 Functions of, 5, 32.
 Russian, 18, 41, 44.
 Blyth, Bishop, 80.
 Bread, Eucharistic, 31, 56.

 Canon of Liturgy, 22, 85.
 Catechism, 28.
 Catechumens, 21.
 Cathedral, 18.

 Ceremonial, 24, 48, 51, 65.
 Chasuble, 17, 52.
 Choir, 15, 16, 56, 61, 65.
 Church, the Universal, 3, 4, 5, 69,
 71.
 attendance, 24, 50.
 Clergy, Russian, 15, 18, 37, 40, 41,
 42, 44, 48, 53.
 Colonies, British, 72.
 Colours, Liturgical, 18.
 Communion, Frequency of, 24.
 the Orthodox, 28, 68, 79.
 of Saints, 34.
 Comprehensiveness, Anglican, 75.
 Confession, Sacramental, 24, 33, 37.
 Confirmation, 28, 29.
 Consistory Courts, 41.
 Constantinople, 7, 8, 28, 89.
 Patriarchs of, 6, 9, 10, 67.
 Convent in Petrograd, 62.
 Corporal, 17.
 Cross, altar, 17.
 Crusaders, 70.

 Dalmatic, 18.
 Deacons, Origin of, 4.
 Russian, 15, 40.
 Dead, Prayers for, 21, 34, 86.
 Dissent, 10, 11.
 Divine Office, 24, 25.
 Divorce, 33.
 Doctrine, Orthodox, 26.
 Doors, Royal. *See* Gates.

- Education, 43.
 Educated classes, 48.
 Empire, Byzantine, 70, 89.
 Entrance, Lesser, 21.
 Great, 22.
Epiklesis. See Invocation of Holy Spirit.
 Episcopate. See Bishops.
 Epistle, 21.
 Eucharist, 28, 30, 31.
 Eugene IV, Pope, 88.
 Exclusiveness, 6, 27.

 Fasting, 49.
 Communion, 24.
 Festivals, Patronal, 50.
Filioque, 26, 43.
 Florence-Ferrara, Council of, 70, 88.
 Foreign Relations, 67-78.

 Gates, Royal, 15, 17, 19, 21, 22, 52, 59.
 Graham, Mr. Stephen, 45.
 Gospel, 17, 21, 43, 47, 84.

 Hierarchy, Christian, 4.
 Russian, 37-44.
 Home, a priest's, 56.

Ikonostas, 14, 15, 16, 19, 21, 65.
 Ikons, 15, 16, 20, 22, 36, 44, 50, 53, 56, 60, 62, 64.
 Immaculate Conception, 69.
 Incense, 18, 22, 23.
Intelligentsia, 37, 48.
 Intemperance, 42, 47.
 Intercommunion, 26, 74, 81.
 Invocation of Holy Spirit, 22, 30, 86.
 of Saints, 35.

 Jerusalem, Council of, 68.
 Patriarchate of, 68, 80.

 Kazan, 84.
 Cathedral, Petrograd, 19, 51.
 Icon of, 36, 63.
 Khitroff, 53.
 Khomiakoff, 30.
 Kieff, 8, 20.
 Kikuyu, 79.

 Lambeth Conference, 79.
 Lavra, Nevsky, 40.
 Troitsky, 9, 41.
 Lights, Altar, 17.
 Little Russia, 2, 16, 51, 53.
 Liturgy, the Divine, 8, 11, 15, 16, 20, 40, 47, 48, 52, 73, 84.
 Liturgy, Analysis of, S. J. C., 21-23.
 of S. Basil, 23.
 Canon of, S. J. C., 85.
 of S. John Chrysostom, 20.
 of Presanctified, 23.
 Loubny, Monastery near, 58.
 Lukar, Patriarch Cyril, 68.

Mantija, 18.
 Marriage, 29, 33, 57, 78.
 Mary, the Blessed Virgin, 35, 86.
 Metropolitan, 41.
 Michael Cerularius, Patriarch, 6.
 Romanoff, Tsar, 10.
 Ministry. See Hierarchy.
 Missions, Russian, 13, 83.
 Mitre, 18.
 Monks, 40, 59, 60.
 Moscow, 8, 83.
 Patriarchs of, 10, 12, 20, 42.

 National Churches, 1, 9, 28, 78.

Nevsky Lavra, 60.
 Nicene Creed, 22, 26.
 Nikhon, Patriarch, 11, 48.
 Noncommunicating Attendance, 31.

Omophorion, 18.
 Orders, Holy, 29, 31, 61, 77.
 Organization, 41.
 Oxford, Bishop of, 83.

Palestine, C.M.S. in, 80.
 Pallium, 18.
 Papal claims, 69, 88.
 Pastoral staff, 18.
 Patriarchs, Origin of, 6.
 Peasants, 13, 37, 45.
 Penance, Sacrament of, 28, 32.
 Peter the Great, 11, 12, 65.
 Petrograd, 2, 8, 19, 20, 51.
 Philaret, Patriarch, 10.
 Metropolitan, 34.
 Philip the Martyr, 12, 13.
 Pilgrims, 41, 53, 58.
 Polish invasion, 9.
Ponomar, 39.
 Preaching, 37.
 Presanctified, Lit. of, 23.
 Priesthood, Origin, 4.
 Functions, 32.
 Russian, 37, 42, 48, 53.
 Procurator of Holy Synod, 12, 41.
 Progress, 13, 42.
 Protestantism, 3, 50, 71.
Prothesis, 16, 21, 22.
 Purgatory, 34, 69.
 Pyx, 17, 19.

Reader, 21.
 Relations, Foreign, 67-73.

Relics, 17, 20, 59.
 Reservation, 17, 19, 31.
 Resurrection, Church of, 64.
 Reunion Societies, 72, 79.
 Roman Church, 3, 10, 69, 77.
 Romanoff Dynasty, 10.
 Rural Dean, 39, 42.
 Russian Church, Origin of, 7, 8.
 Expansion, 8, 9.
 Autonomy, 9, 10.
 Activity, 13, 42, 83.

Sacraments, Doctrine of, 28.
 Sacrifice. *See* Eucharist.
Sakkos, 18.
 Sanctuary, 14, 16, 20.
 Schism, 6, 28.
 Screen. *See* Ikonostas.
 Secular power, 12, 41.
 Sext, 20, 25.
 Siberia, 83.
 S. Isaak's, Petrograd, 19.
 Slavonic, 24.
 Smirnoff, the Archpriest, 83.
 SS. Peter and Paul, Petrograd, 19, 65.
 S. Sophia, 6, 7.
 Statues, 36.
 Stole, 17.
 Surplice, 15.
 Synod, Holy Governing, 12, 20, 41, 72.

Tapers, 21, 22, 62.
 Tatárs, 8, 9, 84.
 Tchoutovka, 16, 51, 53.
 Temperament, Eastern, 25, 35, 69.
 Theology, Orthodox. *See* Doctrine.
 Town life, 2, 50.
 Transubstantiation, 30.
 Troitsky Lavra, 9, 41.

Turks, 10, 67, 70, 78, 88.

Typika, 23.

Ukraine. *See* Little Russia.

Unction of Sick, 29, 34.

Unity, 6, 32, 70, 74, 78, 81.

Vestments, 17, 18, 21, 65.

Vladimir, Grand Prince, 7.

Wordsworth, Bishop, 71, 75.

Worship, 24, 50.

28711

University of California
SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY
405 Hilgard Avenue, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1388
Return this material to the library
from which it was borrowed.

--	--

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY

A 001 117 048 7

Uni